Moderate Trinitarian:

CONTAINING A

DESCRIPTION

OF THE

Holy Trinity,

Both according to Scripture, and approved Authors for Learning, and Adherence to the Trinitarian Doctrine.

BEING

An Argument shewing that *Moderation* may and ought to be shewn by and to Persons of different Conceptions concerning some Circumstances relating to the Knowledg of the Holy Trinity.

Together with a short Reply to Mr. *Joseph Taylor*'s brief Inquiry whether those who own, and those who deny the Divinity of Christ, may communicate together.

By DANIEL ALLEN.

Blessed are the Peace-makers.
But mark such as cause Divisions, and avoid them.

LONDON,
Printed for *Mary Fabian* at *Mercers Chappel* in *Cheapside*, 1699.

THE EPISTLE TO THE READER.

IT was not any Ambition in me (I'll assure thee) to teach my worthy Brethren, of far greater Parts and Indowments than my self, that induced me thus publickly to appear with the ensuing Tract: But it was the hideous noise that the rending and tearing of Churches made, that roused me up, and provoked me thus publickly to expose my self to the censure of many, when I might have slept securely in a whole Skin, with my Sentiments lockt up in my own Breast.

But I saw: What did I see? Why I thought I saw the sparks of misguided and intemperate Zeal in divers well meaning Men, to set some Churches in a Flame; which like the dreadful Conflagration in London, *burnt down to the ground many famous (tho not Parish) Churches. All that have appeared in print about this Subject, so far as I observed, have cried out Peace and Truth: yet notwithstanding, to my discerning, have filled their Buckets with Oil, and threw them into the Flame. How that could quench it judg you: Nay, thought I, if all your printing be in that fashion, the Fire will never be quenched. So I got my Bucket, as I trust, full of Cordial Water, and away come I to the Press. I thought, if I could be but instrumental to quench and save one Post or Beam of the Church, my labour would not be lost; and I shall do more good than they that administer Oil.*

Besides, I considered that those little Books, or Buckets of Oil, were very frequent: every year, or half year, out comes a Piece crying, Heresy! Heresy! *But not one comes like the Dove, with the Olive Branch of Peace in their Mouths; neither was there one Word tending that way in any of their Writings: and hereby many young Converts, as well as others, were much puzled, and made to*

doubt. Wherefore I thought if something were said publickly to demonstrate that there may be a safe Medium and Correspondence found out and maintain'd betwixt the two Parties, it might be acceptable to the Doubtful; and through the Blessing of God might become successful to help the tender Conscience.

There be some so confident and settled, that I have no hopes of them: but then I consider there be many have not renounced their Reason, and therefore will hear Reason; to such I speak. I know some will throw away my Writing as Dirt, while others will condemn it e're they hear it: yet as God hath heretofore blessed my poor Endeavours and Discourses of this kind with success, so I trust these my Labours will not be in vain.

Neither can I expect to want Readers, since there be some, and not a few, who know me, and of them not a few that love me; and they will read me because they love me. And there be some, and not a few, that do not love me, nor the Design I here pursue; and they'l read me to see what they can pick up against me. And there be some, and not a few, that are stagger'd in their own Minds, and they'l read me for their own satisfaction, because they long to hear what can be said for Moderation.

Moreover, I was induced to take this Course, partly because a Book will come to speak where I cannot, and possibly when I cannot: partly because in arguing this case, I find that too commonly there are apt to be Heats and Passions, which commonly prevent persons considering what is said, and the Arguments are many times cut off by the Buttocks, and so condemned, because not well understood. I have seen some Men about these things so eagerly contending, that Heat hath blinded them; and like Men tied back to back, tho they were close together, yet they could not see one another.

But now having my Book in their hand, they may deliberatly consider all my Arguments to the end, without those Molestations which often happen in Debates. And if any man fall into a passion with my Papers, when my Person is not present, if I hear of it, I shall think him to be (as some of them are said to be in the Tribe of Dan*) an angry Fellow.*

Kind Reader,

I tread in a Path heretofore untrod by any that I know of: for tho many worthy men are for Peace and Unity notwithstanding the present Controversy; yet none that I know of, have publickly appeared to vindicate such a Practice. And I wish this my Attempt may be a means to provoke some more sublime Genius than mine, to polish and perfect that which is here rough-drawn. However, since I lead the Van so far as I know, in so troublesome, toilsome, and difficult a Path, between those Extreams which have in many Ages puzled the most Learned Men; if I should appear to stumble, and sometimes to trip and reel,

I hope thy Candor will accept of my well-meaning, and rather pity than censure me: and then thou actest like a Christian. And as I profess not my self infallible, and therefore subject to err; and especially in so untrodden a Path: If any will Christian-like, inform me wherein I am wanting, I shall esteem him among the number of my special Friends. In short, however I may have circumstantially erred, tho I know it not, yet in the main I meant well; and therefore well-meaning men will take it well. I would, if I could, perswade every one to be a Healer of the Breach: the unpleasant sound of Discord hath too long afflicted our Ears, and disturbed our Heads. What pity is it we should so run upon a Party, when amongst our selves there is hardly any considerable Society that can be found: the Matter is so dark, and so variously understood, that we that profess to be most Orthodox, are sadly divided and subdivided in our thoughts, if a strict scrutiny should be made into our Sentiments about it.

That Party of Brethren which I have in this ensuing Treatise mainly and especially endeavoured to vindicate, and to propose a Medium with, are those which several of my Brethren met in Goswel-street *in* London *in the years* 1693, *and* 1696. *did in a printed Paper publickly protest against, and withdraw from. As for my Brethren of* Socinus's *Perswasion concerning Christ, so far as I know their Principles, I am very opposite to them in my own Thoughts, yet have I Charity for them. But having but little converse with them, I conceive I am ignorant of many Points they hold; and therefore I could not so directly include them in what I have said for Moderation: nevertheless I suppose many things that I have wrote, do tend to demonstrate that Christian Charity and Communion may and ought to be shewn to them all, tho, as aforesaid, I could not through Ignorance so directly speak to every point of their case; and I would advise all my Brethren to be wary how they separate from them only on the account of that Principle: The dreadful consequences of Division at all times, but especially at this time of day, ought to make all Christians wary how they rashly adhere to, or abet such a Practice.* Blessed are the Peace-makers: but mark such as cause Divisions amongst you, and avoid them. *And I would advise all Churches diligently to instil Arguments for Peace and Unity in all their Members, but in their young men more especially: for of many Evils that I have seen, this is none of the least, namely, when a young man comes to be useful in the Publick Work of the Church, and in all appearance is like to prove a hopeful and very useful young man; but by and by some fiery Spirit, heated with Zeal in this Controversy, comes,* Jehu *like, and lays before him the eminent Danger he is in, if he abet or communicate with such and such persons; for, says he, they deny the true Christ; and then the usual Arguments in this case are urged. The unwary and unexperienced young man swallows all down, and it presently appears in him: for 'tis commonly seen to be so, if there were something within encouraging in this:*

this case. I know what I speak by experience. As I said, this soon appears in his Discourses and Sermons; 'tis well if he can preach one Sermon without it, or forbear making it the Subject of whole Sermons. And this being a new thing, the People are many of them amused, and their heads filled, and more necessary Truths neglected: and the young men especially have commonly their heads as full of it as an Egg is of Meat. The consequence commonly is the breach of the Peace of the Church. I would advise also all young men to walk in those Paths warily and softly, and beg the assistance of Grace to guide them in the right way; to behave themselves humbly, and be exceeding tender of the Peace of the Church they belong to; and well to consider, that Peace is much sooner broke than repaired.

If my Labours may prove useful, to shew any how far the contending Parties are agreed in the fundamental Points of Faith in God and Christ, and may conduce to the Peace of Christians, I shall have my end: So rests

Thine to serve thee in what I may,

Daniel Allen.

INTRO-

INTRODUCTION.

The Proposition.

That Moderation may and ought to be shewn by, and to Persons of different Apprehensions about some Circumstances relating to the Knowledg and Definition of the Holy Trinity.

BY Moderation I mean Christian Charity and Communion; and what Persons I directly intend, hath been mentioned in my Epistle to the Reader, and what Circumstances I intend, will more plainly appear in the Sequel of my Discourse.

A general Argument to prove the Proposition.

BEcause the Persons here intended do agree, and differ not in their Opinion from their Brethren in any essential point absolutely necessary to Salvation, whether about the Object of Worship, or manner of paying our Christian Obedience to him; I take it for granted, that it will not be disputed that persons so qualified as here expressed, are fit Subjects for Christian Charity and Communion: But the great work will be to prove the Minor, *viz.* That those Persons are such as agree, and differ not in the things aforesaid. And to demonstrate this supposed difficult Case, I shall give a Definition of the Holy Trinity in the order and manner as followeth: *viz.* first, Of the most High God: Secondly, Of the Christ of God: Thirdly, Of the Spirit of God. And I shall describe them according to Scripture-Revelation, and the explanation of approved Authors both for Learning, Parts, and Adherence to the Athanasian Belief, both antient and modern; that so thereby I may shew both where the difference is not, and where it is; that a Judgment thereon may the easier be made. And for the more clear and distinct understanding of the matter, I shall handle my Discourse concerning each of these three apart. And first concerning the *most High God.*

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Of the most High God.

THis Chapter I ſhall divide into three Sections: Firſt, of the means whereby God is known to Men: Secondly, what God moſt High is: Thirdly, concerning the manner of paying Adoration and Worſhip to him.

SECT. I.

Of the Means by which God is known to Men.

THE Means to know God are twofold; firſt, External: Secondly, Internal.

The External Means are the five Senſes, informing the Judgment and Underſtanding, by and from the Works and Word of God: for there is no rational Man, but hears, ſees, taſtes, ſmells, and feels, ſufficiently to inform and convince him that there is a God, (yea a great and glorious one, the firſt Cauſe of all things.)

1. From his Works. *Rom.* 1. 19, 20. *Becauſe that which may be known of God is manifeſt in them: for the inviſible things of him from the Creation of the World are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the things that are made, even his eternal Power and Godhead.*

But 2. The Imprint of God's Image on the Creature (even the wonderful Power, Wiſdom and Skill which he hath ſhewed in forming it, and providing for it) whereby our Underſtanding is informed of him through the five Senſes, is but a rough Draught of his Shadow, in compariſon of the more ample Diſcovery we have of him in his Word; by which further and clearer Diſcovery our Underſtandings are informed through the Senſes of hearing it, and ſeeing it to read it.

All this Knowledg attained by means of our Senſes is external or outward; and tho neceſſary, yet is not of it ſelf a ſaving Knowledg of God, but hath its Reſidence in the Head.

That it is neceſſary is evident: for if we do not know there is a God, or know the true God by ſome infallible Demonſtrations, we can never regularly, no nor indeed at all, ſerve God, except blindly, like the *Athenians*, who worſhipped they knew not what (or the *Unknown God:*) And tho we may all in ſome ſenſe ſay ſo of our ſelves, in as much as none can find out the Almighty to perfection; yet of ſuch a Knowledg of God as in and by his Word and Works he ordinarily diſcovers of himſelf, we ought not to be ignorant: which what it is, and what it is not, ſhall be my endeavours anon to ſhew. And again, that this Knowledg alone is not ſaving, appears, becauſe thouſands there be who have and can diſcourſe very well of God againſt Atheiſtical Notions, who yet nevertheleſs remain deſtitute of true ſaving Faith and Communion with him: therefore altho the external Knowledg of God be good, yea a neceſſary thing in its place; yet it is not ſaving, except ſanctified and joined with the internal Knowledg of God.

Which is the ſecond thing, or kind of Knowledg I am to ſpeak to; and that is that mentioned and intended Mat. 11. 27. *All things are delivered to me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father ſave the Son, and he to whomſoever the Son will reveal him.* This Knowledg properly dwells in the Heart, and is attained by the Exerciſe of ſaving.

ving Faith wrought by the Spirit of Christ; it flows from an inward ſpiritual Communion the Soul hath with God, through the Mediator, by which the humble Soul ſees the Almighty paſſing by, blotting out, and pardoning its Sins, and ready and willing to pour into its Boſom all neceſſary good things of all kinds; from whence are nouriſhed Hope, Peace, Joy, and Love.

This Knowledg is ſaving, and it is as ſoon attained by Perſons of weak and mean Judgment that ſincerely ſeek it, as by any whatſoever, as appears in *Mat.* 11. 25. where Chriſt *thanks his Father in that he had hid thoſe things from the Wiſe and Prudent, and had revealed them unto Babes.*

SECT. II.

Concerning God moſt High, what he is.

IN this Section you have a Deſcription of God moſt High, reſpecting his Eſſence, Being, or Subſtance, and his Eſſential Properties: and firſt, in the Negative; Secondly in the Affirmative: and that firſt, according to plain Texts of Scripture; ſecondly, according to ſeveral Authors. In which Diſcourſe are included theſe following uſeful Particulars, *viz.*

Firſt, How far the contending Parties are agreed. Secondly, wherein they differ; the Caſe and the Controverſy betwixt them fairly propounded, examined, opened, and explained. In which are theſe things following *obſervable.*

1. That thoſe things concerning the Knowledg of the moſt High, wherein they are agreed, are very *plain* from Scripture and Reaſon; but the controverſal part very *obſcure*, not only to Reaſon and the Unlearned, but alſo to the Underſtandings of the moſt Profound and Learned.

2. That the things wherein they are agreed are plainly in words at length declared, both in the Old and New Teſtament, as matters to be owned and believed; and *therefore* abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation; But the controverſal part is not preſſed as a thing to be underſtood, or neceſſary to be believed by the Worſhippers of this God: In the Old Teſtament hardly any Footſteps of it appear; and 'tis aſſerted only by and from conſequences from the new Teſtament.

3. That both Orthodox and Hereticks (ſo called) are agreed in all the Eſſentials and neceſſary parts of Truth, reſpecting the Knowledg of the moſt High God, harmoniouſly and unanimouſly owning and teaching the ſame things of his Eſſence and eſſential Properties: The Hereticks (ſo eſteemed) owning and worſhipping *the ſame God, and no other*, that made Heaven and Earth, and appeared to *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 1. not denying but firmly owning *all and whole, and every part of the ſame Eſſence, and all and every eſſential Property thereof*, according as the above-named Orthodox do.

4. That the great Controverſy and Difference concerning God betwixt the abovementioned Parties is not eſſential, but only circumſtantial, *viz.* about the manner or Mode of its ſubſiſting, and not about the Divine Eſſence it ſelf.

As touching the Knowledg of God, I ſhall treat firſt negatively: He is not any graven Image, or Device of Man's Hands, *Acts* 17. 29. nor no Man; becauſe Man is mortal, but God eedureth for ever, *Pſal.* 136. 13. nor no Angel; firſt, becauſe they are made; ſecondly, are Meſſengers, *Heb.* 1. 7, 14. But he is without beginning, and above all, therefore not created nor ſent.

But Secondly, In the affirmative, God is a Spirit or Spiritual Subſtance, *John* 4. 24. Not a created Spirit, as the Angels; but an infinite, independent, intire, inviſible Eſſence; the firſt Cauſe of, and ſoveraign *higheſt* Power over all things: Infinite, incomprehenſible, unſearchable in Glory, in Power, in Strength, in Wiſdom, in Knowledg, in Juſtice, in Love, in Mercy, in Bounty, in Goodneſs, in Purity, in Compaſſion, in E-

 ternity,

ternity, in Truth and Perfection.

These are the essential and inseparable Properties of the Divine Essence or Being of God most High, *the immediate Object of Divine Worship.*

There may be, and Scripture shews there are some who in a subordinate manner bear the name of God, because he allows it them as ruling from and under him; and therefore as Viceroys or chief Magistrates under God in their places, they bear, tho less properly, the name of God (to give an instance or two in the room of many) of this kind or sort are Angels, of whom *Paul* speaks, 1 *Cor.* 8. 15. where he saith, *There be that are called Gods in Heaven*; who surely could not be false Gods, for they could not get to Heaven; therefore Angels through the Excellency of their work obtain that honourable Name; and so do men, *John* 10. 35. But to pass this; only he that hath these essential Properties, is God *most High:* on which Properties I'll inlarge a little. If he be invisible, then it is not safe for me to form any shape of him in my Apprehensions, any otherwise than a Glorious, unwordable Being. If he be independent, then he stays only on himself, and all things stay on him. If he be infinite in Power and Perfection, *then he is a single uncompounded Essence, only one in Number and Being:* For it is morally impossible that there should be two *infinite Beings*; for if one be infinite, the other cannot: and it is alike impossible that there should be two *most Highs*; for if they are equal, neither of them both can say that he is the *most* High, because there is another as high as he. Also it alike argues Imperfection; for if one Most High be sufficient, then another is needless; and where there is more than needs, it is *Imperfection.* Again, if one most High of himself be not sufficient without another, that argues *Imperfection.* Therefore they that worship the true and most High God, must and ought to conceive of him as a *single* impartible Being or Essence; *one* in Power, in Will, in Thought, in Knowledg, and in all things belonging to his *Essence.* And so hath God directed us to conceive of him in his Word; *Deut.* 6. 4. *Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord.* Isa. 44. 6. *Besides me there is no God.* Mark 12. 32. *There is one God, and there is none other but he.* 1 Cor. 8. 6. *But to us there is but One God: There is none other God but one.* Ephes. 4. 6. *There is One God and Father of all, who is above all.*

Thus far am I come safely, no body having any thing to contradict or gainsay: (that is, no body that owns the *true God*) But on all hands we are agreed about the Eternal Essence and Divine Properties.

These things as undeniable, all Christian Men believe, the Scripture proves, and God's Works manifest. This Description is necessary for me to understand, in order to direct me how to place and exercise my Faith in God aright, how to pay my Duties and Worship to him, and consequently *to my Salvation.*

But now I am arrived at the Borders of the Controversy betwixt the *Trinitarians* and the *Unitarians*, the *Athanasians* and nicknam'd *Arians.*

But to pass my Task, 'tis requisite to give yet a further Description of this *One most High God*; which following Description is said to be drawn from Scripture consequences, but is much more plainly set down in words at length in other Authors.

1. I shall first cite the Athanasian Creed on this Subject: 'The Catholick Faith is this, 'That we worship one God in Trinity, and 'Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the 'Persons nor dividing the Substance.

2. The Nicene Creed says thus: 'I believe 'in One God the Father, Maker of Heaven 'and Earth, and of all things visible and in'visible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the 'only begotten Son of God; begotten of 'the Father before all Worlds; God of God, 'Light of Light; very God of very God, be'gotten not made; of one Substance with 'the Father, by whom all things were made: 'And in the Holy Spirit, the quickening 'Spirit, who proceeds from the Father and 'the Son, and in like manner is adored and 'glorified with the Father and the Son, and 'who spake by the Prophets.

3. Next I shall cite the first of the 39 Articles of the Church of *England*; 'There is but *One* living and true God, *&c.* and in Unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of 'one Substance, Power and Eternity.

4. Next I shall cite Mr. *Joseph Wright* in his Book intitul'd, *Brief Animadversions on five Articles*, pag. 2. 'So that we did then, and 'do hold that there is *One only true and living God*, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, all 'three of the very same Divine Nature and 'Being. And in the same Book, pag. 3. lin. 28. 'When we say these three are one, we 'did, and now believe that the Father, Word '(or Son) and Holy Spirit, are all three of 'the same Divine Nature and Being from ever-'lasting to everlasting, the Creator and Go-'vernor of all things, *One* only true and living 'God, in three distinct and *undivided* Divine 'Persons: Thus far Mr. *Wright*.

5. Next I shall cite Dr. *Owen* in his Book intituled, *The Doctrine of the Trinity vindicated*, printed *An.* 1669, pag. 29. 'In the Decla-'ration of this Doctrine unto the edification 'of the Church, there is contained a further 'explanation of the things before asserted, as 'proposed, directed, and in themselves the 'Object of our Faith; namely, how God is 'one in respect of Nature, Substance, Essence, 'Godhead, or Divine Being. How being Fa-'ther, Son, and Holy Ghost, he subsisteth in 'these three distinct Persons. And *Pag.* 112. 'The distinction which the Scripture reveals 'between Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is that 'whereby they are three Persons distinctly sub-'sisting in the *same* Divine Essence or Being. 'Now a Divine Person is nothing else, but a 'Divine Person upon the account of an espe-'cial Property subsisting in an especial man-'ner: as in the Person of the Father there 'is the Divine Essence or Being, with its 'Property of begetting the Son, subsisting 'in an especial manner in the Father; and 'because this Person hath the *whole* Divine 'Nature, all the essential Properties of that 'Nature are in that Person. *Page* 122. See-'ing here that the name of God supplies the 'place of a Species, tho it be singular abso-'lutely, as it respects the Divine Nature, 'which is *absolutely singular* and *One*, and can-'not be *multiplied*; yet in respect of commu-'nication it is otherwise, it is communicated 'unto more.

6. I shall cite next Mr. *John Preston* in his Book intitul'd, *Life eternal, or a Treatise of the Knowledg of the Divine Essence*, fourth Edition, printed 1634, page 48, 49. 'If there 'be *two things* in God, then there is *Multi-'plication*: now all Multiplication ariseth from 'some Imperfection, from some want and de-'fect: for if *one* would serve, *two* would be 'needless; if one Medicine would cure, two 'would be unnecessary; *so in all things else*. 'So that the reason of Multiplication is, be-'cause *one* will not serve the turn: Therefore 'God being all-sufficient, it is not needful, 'yea it *cannot* be, that a breaking in *two* should 'be admitted in him, and consequently he 'must be *most simple*, without all *composition*, 'a pure and entire Essence, full of himself, 'and nothing besides. And a little further thus: Wheresoever there is any composi-'tion, there must be two or three things, 'so that there may be a Division; they are 'separable, tho not separated: But where 'Division is, there may be a Dissolution, and 'so Destruction, though it never be. But of 'God we cannot say that this may be, and con-'sequently there cannot be *two* things in him: 'but what he is, he is *One* most simple, most 'pure, and most entire Being, without all 'Composition and Multiplication. If God be 'not simple, there must be parts of which he 'is compounded; but in God blessed for ever 'there are no *parts*, because then there should 'be Imperfection, for every *part* is imperfect. I shall cite one Author more, and then make some use of the whole.

7. Mr. *Thomas Monk* in his *notable* Book of the Trinity, intituled, *A Cure for the cankering Error*, pag. 91. has these words: 'Not to 'the end it should make a Multitude of Gods, 'or *divide* the Essence, but to distinguish 'the Persons, because tho there be one Per-'son of the Father, another Person of the 'Son, and another of the Holy Ghost, yet 'the Father is not another thing, or another 'God distinct from the Son and the Holy 'Ghost; neither is the Son another thing, 'or another God distinct from the Father and 'the Holy Ghost; neither is the Holy Ghost 'another:

'another thing, or another God distinct from 'the Father and the Son; because the Nature 'of God is but *one* and indivisible; although 'the Father be one, the Son another, and 'the Holy Ghost another: and therefore they 'are not of divers natures, of another and '*divers* Substance, not conjoined or knit to-'gether in one Substance (as Men which 'have one common Essence) not only of the '*like* Substance, but of *one* and the same Sub-'stance; have the same Essence, the same 'Eternity, the same Will, the same Opera-'tion, *&c.* And *page* 57. '*Qu.* Be there 'any parts or kinds in God? Answ. *None at* '*all*, because he is a most *simple* Essence; 'which doth admit no *Composition or Division*, 'and simply and in every respect of Unity *one*.'

Having given you this Description of the Most High God, both from the Holy Scriptures, and those Authors; I shall now come to make that use of it, which at first I promised and intended; and that is, to shew, that there is no *essential*, but only a *circumstantial* difference in the Apprehensions of the Parties before named, concerning the Most High God, and the Description here given of Him. Only note, that that which concerns the difference about the Son and Holy Ghost, will be here spoken unto but occasionally and in short, because I shall treat more largely, distinctly, and directly of them in their proper place: Whereas I am now precisely treating of the *Most High God*.

But to the end that a plain Discovery of the Difference concerning the Most High (which hath made such a Noise and Confusion in the World in many Ages, and in our times) may appear, I shall state the Sum of the case in this one short Question.

Whether the most Glorious, Eternal, Intire, Uncompounded, Undivided, Undividable Essence of the one Most High God, do (at the same time, and at all times from Eternity to Eternity) subsist all and whole *both* in one *Person*, *and also in like manner* in three *Persons*, *or all, and whole only in* one *Person*?

Our dividing Brethren are for the first part of this Question, and our accused Brethren are for the latter part thereof.

That this is the Sum of the Difference, and that this Difference is only Circumstantial, is now my business to make appear; which I shall endeavour to do, partly from the former Description and Quotations, partly from the natural force of *our* Opinions, and partly from further Quotations.

But in the first place, give me leave to treat a little in the Negative. Let us first observe where the difference is *not*: The Question controverted is not whether or no any of the Idols of *Israel* of old, or any of the Multitude of the *Ægyptian* Gods, or antient Heathen Deities formerly worshipped by them, or the false Deities worshipped by Infidels in foreign Parts now; I say, the Question is not whether any of these be the true God or no. Neither is the Question whether the glorious Essence or Godhead, which the Scripture says is in Heaven, whether He alone, and *only* He, be the Most High God, and that we ought to pay our duty to none but Him, and such as He shall *delegate under him*: for these things are owned on all hands. Neither is it at all questioned on either hand whether there be above *one* Most High God, or whether his Essence be infinite, eternal, independent, all Wisdom, Power, Greatness, Holiness, Justice, Love, Mercy, Knowledg, Bounty, Goodness, Truth, Perfection. Nay, in *all* the Essential Properties of the Divine Nature which Holy Scripture and Reason do teach, there is still a joint Consent and Agreement on all hands. Where then is the difference, as to cause so loud a noise of *Heresy! Heresy!* these Men deny the Foundation of all Christian Religion and Worship; nay deny the true God!

Why let us consider a little, since there is an agreement about, and in all the essential Properties of the true God, and an Agreement *which* Essence is the true God. Is there any known material difference about the Essence it self? the matter of it let us examine.

No, we find none here neither: for that it is an intire, uncompounded, impartible, undividable, *one Substance*, or Essence, those supposed Hereticks say, and so *say* we. Let us look over the Quotations already cited: First, says *Athanasius*'s Creed, *not dividing the Substance*. 2. The Nicene Creed says, *One Substance*. 3. The first of the 39 Articles says, *one living and true God*, without Body, *Parts* or Passions, of *One* Substance. 4. Mr. *Wright*

Wright ſays, that all three are in the *ſame* Divine Nature, and being in three diſtinct and *undivided* Divine Perſons; and on that account grants that the Father is the *only* true God. 5. Dr. *Owen* ſays, God is *One* in reſpect of his Nature, Subſtance, Eſſence, Godhead, or Divine Being: and further ſays, that the name of God is a ſingular *abſolutely*, as it reſpects the Divine Nature; which is abſolutely ſingular and *One*, and cannot be *multiplied*. 6. Mr. *Preſton* ſays that God being *Allſufficient*, it is not needful, yea it cannot be that a breaking in *two* ſhould be admitted in him, and conſequently he muſt be moſt *ſimple* without all *compoſition*, a pure and intire Eſſence, full of himſelf and nothing beſides: And a little further ſays, conſequently there cannot be two things in him, but what he is he is *One* moſt ſimple, moſt pure, and moſt intire being, without all Compoſition and Multiplication: and further he ſays there are no parts in him. Laſtly, Mr. *Monk* ſays, That the Perſons, tho diſtinct amongſt themſelves, yet are not differing things one from another, becauſe the nature of God is but *One* and indiviſible; and further ſays, they are not conjoined or knit together in one Subſtance, as Men which have one common Eſſence: They are not only of the *like* Subſtance, but of *one and the ſame Subſtance, have the ſame Eſſence*, &c. And in anſwer to the Queſtion, Are there any *Parts* or Kinds in God? anſwers, none at all; becauſe he is a moſt ſimple Eſſence, which doth admit of no *Compoſition or Diviſion*, and ſimple, and in every reſpect of Unity *One*.

Thus you ſee, having ſummed up the Evidence, as ſays the Foreman, ſo they ſay all, they are all agreed in their Verdict; both Orthodox, and Hereticks (ſo called) are thus far in all reſpects jointly and fully agreed as with one Voice, to publiſh that their apprehenſion of the one true God reſpecting his Eſſence, is an *undivided, undividable*, intirely *one Subſtance*, not ſubſiſting or poſſible to be ſubſiſting in parts, or having any *Parts* in him. And ſo ſays the Scripture, God is *a Spirit*, not *Spirits*.

And indeed this Doctrine of the *Unity* of the Divine Eſſence we muſt maintain, or elſe we do nothing: for if once we admit of ſeveral parts in that Eſſence, we may as well admit (and there ſeems a neceſſity that it ſhould be) ſo many *ſeveral Spirits*, and indeed ſo many *Moſt High Gods*; which can be called one only by conſent and agreement, or at moſt one in kind.

But the Doctrine of Plurality of Gods *moſt High* is repugnant to Reaſon, refuted by Scripture, and abhorred by Mahometans.

Beſides, if you divide *Eſſence* in your thoughts, then you muſt divide the *Eſſential Properties*, ſuch as Mercy, Juſtice, Wiſdom, Bounty, and the reſt; I ſay, you muſt divide them into as many parts as you divide the Eſſence in your thoughts: As for example: Suppoſe you divide it into three parts; then you muſt ſuppoſe in your mind three Attributes of Juſtice, three of Mercy, three of Wiſdom, and ſo of all the reſt; or elſe you muſt imagine ſome of the Attributes in one part, and ſome in another: as thus, Juſtice and Power in one, Mercy and Wiſdom in another, Truth and Bounty in another, and ſo of the reſt: or elſe you muſt imagine that ſome of the parts have none of the Attributes, and that will be *Blaſphemy and Nonſenſe*; ſince I think all will confeſs that nothing can be *eſſentially* God moſt High, but that which is or hath all the Divine Eſſential Properties. And ſo go which way to work you will, if you admit of *Parts*, you confound the *Subſtance*, as *Athanaſius* ſays. But enough of this. We are unanimouſly agreed in the Unity and Undividedneſs of the Divine Eſſence. Well, thus far are we come, looking for the difference, but finding none. Why where is it? What is become of it? that great difference that hath troubled the World and Church ſo many hundred years, and ſet good men together by the ears Tooth and Nail, occaſion'd a great Volume of hard, bitter, ſharp, biting Words againſt each other? and yet you ſee we are all agreed about the main Matter, Subſtance, or Eſſence of the moſt High; nay and in all the eſſential Properties of him too: And yet can there be any material difference about him notwithſtanding? that's ſtrange! how can this thing be?

Why

Why yes, yet there is a difference: but whether a material one or no, must be left to my considering Reader to judg. It is not whether this Divine undivided Essence, about which, and all its essential Properties, we are *fully* agreed; whether, I say, it subsist in one Divine Person: For this is also *jointly* agreed on all hands, as I shall presently shew: But it is this, Whether it subsist *only in One* Divine Person, or *both in One*, and also in like manner in *Three*. The Orthodox is for the latter, the Heretick affirms the former.

Thus near are we come, and I doubt not anon to shew you that we are yet nearer than all this. But first I'll demonstrate this: tho first of all we must treat of the word *Person*, what in this Controversy is understood by it: And because I am a little at a loss to explain the thing, I will therefore give you Dr. *Owen* and Mr. *Monk*'s Description. First, Dr. *Owen*, if you look back to the first Quotations of him: 'Now (says he) a Divine 'Person is nothing else but a Divine Person 'upon the account of an especial Property 'of *subsisting* in an especial manner. Secondly, Dr. *Hall*, as I find him quored by Mr. *Monk*, Page 46. of his *Cure for the cankering Error*, hath these Words: 'We may think 'here of *one* Substance in *three Subsistences*, 'one *Essence* in *three Relations*, one *Jehovah* 'begetting, begotten, proceeding, Father, 'Son, Spirit: yet so as the Son is *no other* 'thing from the Father, but another *Person*; 'or the *Spirit* from the *Son*. Also Mr. *Monk*, in his 63 page, propounds this Question, 'How doth the word *Essence* differ 'from the word *Person* in God? his answer 'is, Essence is the Nature, which is not 'more belonging to one, and *less* to another 'of the three Persons, but common to them 'all, yea one and the same, and cannot be 'divided; *and is all in each one of them*, not 'without them, subsisting by it self, to 'wit, the very Deity it self. And therefore 'the essential Properties which be in them 'are one in number, of one nature. Now 'Person is the subsisting in the Divine Nature, or the nature of God; which having 'relation to others, is distinguished by 'some incommunicable Properties: for indeed the Persons are only distinguished, not *severed*: as indeed three men are indeed separated, tho they be one in kind. 'The Reason is, because the Essence of God 'is infinite and impartible, and therefore it 'is all in every Person, which are not severed one from another, but only distinguished amongst themselves. But as for 'the Essence of Angels and Men it is finite 'and partible, so that it is not all in every 'single Person, but part in one, and part 'in another. One Passage he hath in page 39. 'Fourthly, All the Attributes whether 'relative, negative, or positive, or if any 'other, in that they proceed from the *Essence*, 'are true of every *Person*, because the *whole* 'Essence is in every Person.' The Father is 'eternal, the Son is eternal, the Holy Spirit 'is eternal, because the *whole Essence* is in 'every one of them.

I need not cite any more, because so far as I am able to distinguish, Dr. *Owen*, Dr. *Hall*, and Mr. *Monk* have spoken the general sense of all that have writ on this Subject. And now having shewed you the Description that these men give, if I can tread right in this narrow Path, I will try to give you, according to the best of my judgment, the sense of what they mean by the word *Person* or *Persons* in the Divine *Essence*.

First then, I do suppose by *Person* here is not intended a distinct separate Being from the *Essence*, or from one another; nor yet a distinct spiritual Substance: for this were to divide the Substance into three distinct divided Persons. Neither must it be supposed that Person hath a distinct Mind or Will from the Essence or the other Persons, for that will necessarily imply three or four Minds and Wills in the Most High, which would be absurd. Neither must the Person have any one part of the Divine Essence peculiar to it self, for that would divide the Essence into parts, and the Divine Properties also, and so bring all into confusion, as hath been shewn: therefore *Person* must be supposed to be something not at all *separated* from any part of the *Essence*, or of the other *Persons*. 'Therefore, says Mr. *Monk*, Essence 'is

'is the nature which is not more belonging 'to one, and leſs to another of the three 'Perſons, but common to them all, yea *one and the ſame*, and cannot be *divided*, 'and is all in each one of them; and there- 'fore concludes, that the eſſential Properties 'which be in them are one in number, that 'is, that the eſſential Property of Love, 'and the eſſential Property of Mercy, 'and the eſſential Property of Juſtice, 'and all the reſt, are *all and whole* in 'one Perſon, and *all and whole* in *another*. And thereſore elſewhere ſays, 'That all the 'Attributes (both relative, negative, and 'poſitive, or any other) of the Divine Eſ- 'ſence, are true of every Perſon, becauſe 'the *whole Eſſence* is in every *Perſon*. So that in ſhort the thing is this, that a *Perſon* ſeparate from *Eſſence* is nothing, but is only the *whole* undivided Eſſence, ſubſiſting in a certain *manner or mode*; that is, in one manner in the Father, in another manner or mode in the Son, and in another manner in the Holy Ghoſt: that is, not three diſtinct intelligent *Beings*, but *only one* infinite intire diſtinct intelligent *Being*, ſubſiſting in three undivided inſeparable *Manners or Modes*.

And this is the general ſenſe, ſo far as I was ever able to diſcern, of all the Authors that ever I read on this Subject.

But if this be the Knot of the Controverſy about the moſt High God, perhaps ſome will ſay it is *dark*: I ſay, perhaps ſo too; very like it may be ſo, elſe what's the matter, think you, that ſo many Men who have long been loving Friends and good Men, yet by this Controverſy have had their Eyes ſo blinded, that they could not ſee one another with an Eye of Charity? And what elſe ſhould be the reaſon that in the Churches where it hath been controverted, there hath oftentimes aroſe ſuch a Miſt and thick Darkneſs, that many could not ſee their Seats at the Lord's Table? And if any ſhall ask me the meaning of the matter, I muſt anſwer with Mr. *Monk*, page 43. That the perfect manner how one perſon is in another is incomprehenſible and unutterable in this Life.

And for my own part, I ſhall much rather chuſe to *admire* the matter than to illuſtrate my explanation; and I will add with Mr. *Monk* in the aforeſaid page, to be wiſe above what is written, is not Wiſdom, but *perilous* Sin and Folly.

And it will not out of my Head, but that it had been much better for every body to have left off at the Deſcription of the moſt High, even there where we on all hands were ſo well agreed, rather than to have run further for a plainer Deſcription till we have almoſt *loſt* our ſelves.

And now a word by the way to my Brethren, who for diſtinction ſake I call of the *Athanaſian Perſwaſion*. Many, or moſt of you are not ignorant of the bitter Words and Deportment that have dropt from the Tongues and Pens of many againſt their Brethren, becauſe of their differing Apprehenſions about the moſt High God: and now thus far are we come, ſcanning the difference, and it remains in this narrow Corner; for all are agreed that that Glorious Eternal Being, whoſe Throne is in the Heavens, or the Heavens is his Throne, whom the Heaven and Heaven of Heavens cannot contain, whoſe Preſence fills Heaven and Earth, even that this Glorious Being or Eſſence, and he *only*, from everlaſting to everlaſting is the one and *only* moſt High God, the Original of all Power, Authority, Wiſdom, Life, Light, Knowledg, Nature, Perfection, Goodneſs, Bounty, Mercy, Juſtice, Love, Action, and Being. And further, you are all agreed that this very Eſſence is an impartible, *uncompounded* Eſſence: So that our differing Brethren own the ſame moſt High, the *ſame* Eſſence for *Number*, *Nature*, *and Kind*, owning *all* and *whole* of the Divine *Eſſence* and eſſential *Properties*, as full in *all* reſpects as we our ſelves, not abating one of them, no nor any *part* of one of them, worſhipping it with the *ſame*, and as much Adoration and Reſpect as we our *ſelves*, owning the very *ſame* Subſtance and *no* other: So that the difference is not about *Subſtance*, Matter, or Properties; but only about a certain *Manner* or *Mode* of ſubſiſting: yea yet further, both agreeing that whatever is God moſt High, whether Eſſence or Property, tho improper to diſtinguiſh it, is *all* and *whole* in the *Perſon* of the

Father. This none of us all *dare* deny: for then we ſhall throw down our own Opinion, Root and Branch. Nay further, it is jointly agreed by us that whatſoever is God moſt High, whether Eſſence, Attribute, or Perſon, it is *all* in *every one*, and conſequently in the *Father*: See Mr. *Monk* pag. 38. Becauſe a Perſon ſignifies both the Eſſence and its Relative Property, all the Perſons having one and the ſame Eſſence, it followeth that in reſpect of the Eſſence one perſon *is in another*. Thus all amounts to thus much: You ſay that Eſſence, and all that we properly call God, and worſhip, is in the Perſon of the Father, and ſo ſay they: only you require them to confeſs that the Eſſence ſubſiſteth not *only* thus, but *alſo* in *two* other diſtinct *Manners* or *Modes*: This is all. And truly methinks it looks like a very hard caſe, that our Brethren ſhould own the whole Eſſence with all its Royal and Eſſential Properties, and likewiſe own all his mighty Works of old, and now, whereby he hath made himſelf known, and likewiſe reverence and honour it as highly as our ſelves; and yet we muſt exclude them Communion at the Table of the Lord, *only* and meerly for a *Circumſtance*, that is, a differing *Manner* or Mode of ſubſiſting; which yet alſo is ſo *dark* and dubious, that not one of us durſt once *touch* it with our Pens to explain it. Shall we then be ſo poſitive, ſo highly conceited of our own Judgments in ſo *intricate*, ſo myſterious a Matter, which yet at moſt is but a *Circumſtance*, (*viz*. a Mode or Manner of ſubſiſting) not *any* part of the thing it ſelf, the Eſſence it ſelf? Shall we cenſure, condemn, and ſtigmatize our good Brethren, every way elſe as able for Parts, Knowledg, Purity of Manners, and zealous for God and his Ways as our ſelves? Shall we repreſent them Denyers of the true God, Broachers of Hereſies, nay damnable Hereſies? Surely no: Be it far from us; leſt it be thought that an evil Mind hath had dominion over us: more eſpecially, ſince admitting their Sentiments to be in this caſe circumſtantially erroneous (for a *Hereſy* I will not allow it) yet it hinders not at all, or is no Impediment to our paying Adoration or Worſhip to the moſt High, as I ſhall come to ſhew in the next Section. But firſt let me obſerve unto you that all thoſe things reſpecting the Eſſence and eſſential Properties wherein we and all our Brethren are agreed, both Scripture and Reaſon in all plainneſs teaches: But this controverſal part concerning the treble Manner or Mode of the ſubſiſting of the Divine Eſſence, is neither taught by *Reaſon*, nor found in, or is Scripture-Language; I ſay, it is not *Scripture*-Language, but only drawn from ſome Inferences and Conſequences of and from the holy Scripture. I ſay, when we have only Conſequences to foot upon in a caſe of this nature and difficulty, ſtill it calls for the more *Moderation* and Tenderneſs towards perſons of differing Apprehenſions in ſuch a *tender* point, who withal are as orthodox in the *main* every way as our ſelves. But now I come to the next point.

SECT. III.

Concerning the manner how we ought to pay our Worſhip and Adoration to this one moſt High God.

IN the treating of this I ſhall include and reſolve this following Queſtion: Whether it be the *declared* Pleaſure of the Almighty that his Subjects ſhould pay their Adoration to the *Matter* ſubſiſting, or the *Manner* of ſubſiſting?

Or more fully thus: Whether it be the declared pleaſure of the Almighty that his Subjects ſhould pay their Adoration unto him with and under the Conception and Appellation of *One* Supream Soveraign ſingle Subſtance, unſeparable in Eſſence and Divine Properties, ſubſiſting in *one* Perſon? Or, whether it be his pleaſure it ſhould be paid unto him under the notion and appellation of a *ſingle* Eſſence ſubſiſting in

three

three distinct *Manners*, *Modes*, *or Persons?*

In the resolving of this Question I shall premise this by the way: That the Order, Manner, or Mode of paying our Adoration, and our Conceptions of the Object of Worship in the Act of Worship ought not to be regulated by our Conceptions, but to be decided merely by the *Direction* and Rule God is pleased to give us about it in his Word. For it is not what we think fit, but what he says is most proper, and our Duty: And therefore I take this for granted, that the Holy Scriptures are our only whole sufficient Rule to guide us in all points of Faith and good Manners respecting Salvation, to guide us in the understanding of the Object and Act of Worship, and in our conception of the Object in the Act thereof.

And for want of keeping close to this Rule, so many Innovations and Institutions have been introduced; people thinking still to mend things by bringing it nearer to their own Conceptions, have often made it worse in not heeding the Standard.

These things premised, I shall give my Answer to the Question, and do say, that to me it doth not appear that it is the pleasure of God that Worship should be paid unto him under the *appellation*, and with the *conception* of a single Essence subsisting both in *one and three* distinct Manners, Modes, or Persons.

But *rather* that it is his declared Will that his Subjects should pay their Adoration to him under, and with the conception and appellation of *one* supream Soveraign and singular Substance, inseparable in Essence and Divine Properties, subsisting in *one Divine Person* and Spirit. And for this I will give my Reasons.

First, as hath been hinted, I take it for granted that let the Doctrine of three Persons in one Essence be as clear as the Sun, yet with what conceptions we must worship must be *conformable* to God's Word: But now to the Reasons. My first Reason is, notwithstanding the various Appellations which God chose in former Dispensations to make himself known to his Subjects by as the Object of their Worship, tho they did plainly discover the Unity of his Essence, and also his essential Properties, yet I remember not *one* Discovery of him as a single Essence in a *threefold* subsistence, or one Essence and three Persons. And there seems no such discovery under the first Dispensation. Which will appear, first, if we take notice how he discovers himself in general, both at first to *Adam*; secondly to *Noah* before and also after the Flood, and his giving forth the Law to the Generations after the Flood; also to *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Jacob*, *Moses*, and to *Israel* in general; and in particular in giving forth his Law. Now observe in general to all such as he makes discovery of himself as the Object of their Worship, he makes use of such Denominations as are of the singular number, as *I*, *My*, *Me*, or *Mine*; and not *we*, or *ours*. Likewise when any of them did mention this sacred *Majesty* in paying their Worship, they made use of such Expressions, as shewed it was their Sentiment that they conceived of him as *one* intire Object, and not *one* and *three*; as Thee, Thy, Thou, or Thine; not Ye, You, Your, or Yours: which shews that whatever they *believed* of different Persons in that one single Essence, or an *one* intire Substance in a *threefold* Manner or Mode of subsisting (which yet no where *appears* that they, or any of them before-named did) but if so, as aforesaid, yet it appears they *thought* it their Duty to give Appellations to denominate, and consequently to conceive of the Object of their Worship as a single one in one Person, or intelligent Being, without thinking it so material to take notice of Name, or conceive of a threefold manner of subsisting, or a single Essence both in one and three, in the Act of Worship; which yet sure, were this so *material* and essential a part of right Worship, (as now supposed) methinks it would have appeared, if not in *all*, yet at least in *some* of the many Instances we have in Scripture, of Persons expressing themselves in the Act of Worship and Adoration.

But now to return to the first, to wit, God's discovering himself to man: In the first place to avoid an Objection, observe, I am not speaking of what is said when God

ſpeaks concerning making Man, or going down to ſee the Builders of *Babel*; for this is foreign to my preſent buſineſs (which is not now to diſpute *pro* or *con*, either to *prove* or *deny* the Doctrine of three Perſons in one Eſſence) but my particular Buſineſs is to ſhew how God hath *diſcovered* himſelf to Man. Therefore let none cry out and ſay, you have forgot the word *Us* in the forenamed places: For, firſt, whether it be there preciſely demonſtrated three undivided Perſons in one intelligent Being, the Diſſenters from *Athanaſius*'s Creed will not be wanting to bring Reaſons to the contrary, which (as aforeſaid) is not now my *buſineſs* to take notice of. But, ſecondly, obſerve if they do, yet theſe are Words ſpoken in Heaven, which no mortal Man did ever hear, nor were they directed to man, but ſpoken in the Heavenly Manſions by him who perfectly knows and underſtands himſelf. But that which I inſiſt upon is, that always when God directs his Speech to Man, or Men, *diſcovering* himſelf to them as the Object of their Worſhip, he then ſpeaks in the *ſingular* number. Now this I take for granted, becauſe I think it will not be denied that the Manner or Mode of God's deſcribing of himſelf to Man, as the Object of their Worſhip, ought to be the Directions of our Conceptions of him in the Act of Worſhip: And that this is not plural, but ſingular, will appear in the particular Examination of the above-hinted Inſtances.

1. To begin with *Adam*, Gen. 3. 11. *Haſt thou eaten of the Tree, whereof* I *commanded that thou ſhouldſt not eat?* and ver. 15. I *will put enmity*, &c. Then to *Noah*, Gen. 6. 13. *And God ſaid unto* Noah, *The end of all Fleſh is come before* ME, *and behold* I *will deſtroy them*: ver. 17. *Behold* I, *even* I *do bring a Flood of Waters.* Ver. 18. *But with thee will* I *eſtabliſh my Covenant.*

2. The like, or the ſame Expreſſions you have, *Chap.* 7. at ver. 1, 4. and *Chap.* 9. In the Deed, Contract, or Covenant, whereby God makes himſelf *known* to, and with the new World after the Deluge, we find him thus expreſſing himſelf, ver. 3. *The green Herb have* I *given you.* Ver. 5. *Your Blood of your lives will* I *require, at the hand of every Beaſt will* I *require it; and at the hand of every Man's Brother will* I *require it.* Ver. 9. *And* I, *even* I *eſtabliſh* my *Covenant with you.* Ver. 11. *And* I *will eſtabliſh* my *Covenant with you.* Ver. 13. I *do ſet* my *Bow in the Cloud.* Ver. 15. *And* I *will remember my Covenant which is between* Me *and you, and every living Creature of all Fleſh; and the Waters ſhall no more become a Flood to deſtroy all Fleſh.* Obſerve, the Covenant made with all Fleſh, was under the notion of a *ſingle* Being, and not a *threefold* ſubſiſting.

Now touching God's diſcovering and deſcribing himſelf to *Abraham* the firſt time, *Gen.* 12. 1, 2, 3. *Get thee into a Land that* I *ſhall ſhew thee; and* I *will make of thee a great Nation: And* I *will bleſs thee, and* I *will bleſs them that bleſs thee.* The ſecond time of appearance, ver. 7. *And the Lord appeared unto* Abram, *and ſaid, Unto thy Seed will* I *give this Land.* The third time of appearance, *Chap.* 13. 15, 16. Fourth time of appearance, *Chap.* 15. 1. *The word of the Lord came unto* Abraham *in a Viſion ſaying, Fear not,* I *am thy Shield.* Likewiſe ver. 7, 14, 18. and *Chap.* 17. 1, 2. at the making the Covenant the Lord appeared unto *Abraham* and ſaid, I *am the Almighty God, walk before* Me, *and be thou perfect*; *and* I *will make* My *Covenant between* Me *and thee.* But not to mention any more of *Abraham*, which we might, let it ſuffice that at every appearance recorded it was never with a *plural* Denomination.

Next, for *Iſaac*, Chap. 26. 2, 3, 4, 5. *And the Lord appeared unto him, and ſaid, Go not down into* Egypt; *dwell in the Land which* I *ſhall tell thee of, ſojourn in this Land, and* I *will be with thee, and will bleſs thee, and unto thy Seed* I *will give all theſe Countries*; *and* I *will perform the Oath which* I *ſware unto* Abraham *thy Father*; *and* I *will make thy Seed to multiply. Becauſe that* Abraham *obeyed* my *Voice, and kept* my *Charge,* my *Commandments,* my *Statutes, and my Laws.*

Next, for *Jacob*, Chap. 28. verſ. 13, 15. *And behold, the Lord ſtood above it, and ſaid, I am the Lord God of* Abraham *thy Father, and the God of* Iſaac; *the Land whereon thou lyeſt, to thee will* I *give it. And behold,* I *am with*

with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into this Land: for I will not leave thee until I have done that which I have spoken.

Next we come to *Moses*, Exodus 3. ver. 6. *Moreover he said, I am the God of thy Father, the God of* Abraham, *the God of* Isaac, *and the God of* Jacob. And in ver. 13, 14, 15. the most High is particularly desired by *Moses* upon an emergent occasion to discover himself, that he and *Israel* might know how to conceive of him aright. And God gives him particular direction what to say: *And* Moses *said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the Children of* Israel, *and shall say unto them, The God of your Fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them? And God said unto* Moses, I AM *that* I AM; *and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of* Israel, I AM *hath sent me unto you.* And God said moreover unto *Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of* Israel, *The Lord God of your Fathers, the God of* Abraham, *the God of* Isaac, *and the God of* Jacob *hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all Generations.*

Now surely if the conception of a Trinity of Persons in God were so absolutely necessary in the Act of Worship as is now taught, who can but suppose that the Almighty, especially being so *particularly* desired to declare himself, and that also in order, and to the end that *Israel* might put their trust, and act faith in him aright; who can think, I say, but that the Almighty would have made a *plain* discovery thereof in this place? On the other side; tho God do here make himself known by such Names or Memorials as sufficiently discover the Oneness of his Being, and also his essential Properties, both Mercy, Goodness, Wisdom, Truth, Love, Bounty, Justice, and the rest, which were all discovered to *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, whose God he here declares himself to be; yet what Man not prepossessed can ever imagine that God intended, or *Israel* could by this Description of God, conceive of him as a *threefold* subsistence?

And to the end that you may see the scope of this Description in others Opinions as well as my own, I will quote two Authors: first, Mr. *Monk* in the Book forecited, *page* 25. "*I AM*, that is (saith he) I am the 'only true God, truly subsisting, and not 'only through the opinion of Men as Idols 'are: I am he that hath an everlasting Be- 'ing, unchangeably subsisting of it self, not 'depending upon others, infinite, *most simple*, 'the Author and Cause of the being of all 'things: not a borrowed, changeable, fi- 'nite, dependent, and *compound* Being, *&c.* 'as all the Creatures have: Of this mine 'Essence will I give thee the highest, most 'express and general name of all, [*He that is.*]

Secondly, I shall quote Mr. *Preston* in his forecited Book, *page* 96. 'As if he should 'say, if yet they cannot understand what 'this name is, it is the same that I was 'known by to *Abraham*, to *Isaac*, and to '*Jacob*: what I was to them, the same will 'I be to you. I was known to them by my 'Word, and by my Works, and by my Mi- 'racles; and the same shall you find me: it 'is that God which hath sent me unto you '[this is my name.] Which Words are to 'be referred not only to the latter Words, 'but to the former, *I AM THAT I 'AM.* Thus far Mr. *Preston*. And thus you see here is nothing perceived in this Discovery of a *Trinity* of Persons in others Opinions, or our own Reason.

The next discovery of himself we find in *Exod.* 6. 23. *And God spake unto* Moses, *and said, I am the Lord: And I appeared unto* Abraham, *and unto* Isaac, *and unto* Jacob, *by the name of God Almighty, but by my Name* JEHOVAH *was I not known to them:* Here I note two things; first, that God doth plainly here declare how he taught and directed *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob* to act Faith in, and *conceive* of him, *viz.* as a God Almighty, All-powerful, All-sufficient, All-wise, *&c.* But he mentions not in the least his subsisting in a *Trinity*. Secondly, I observe that God doth here make a more full, copious, profound and ample *Discovery* of himself to his Subjects than at any time heretofore, by giving them his Name *JEHOVAH*, being the clearest and most proper name of his Being and undivided essential

ſential inſeparable Properties: which ſacred Name the Jews deſervedly and greatly reverence; inſomuch that the Author of the Book, intituled, *The Father's Spectacles to behold his Child*, ſaith in his 110. page, the Jews hold it not lawful to uſe the name *JEHOVAH* at all, but by the Prieſts in the Sanctuary only, and that but once a year. And citing *Cole*'s Expoſitor, ſays, *JEHOVAH* is never pronounced by the Jews on pain of Death, only by the Prieſt in the *Sanctum Sanctorum*, and that on the day of Expiation, being but once a year. And yet notwithſtanding this further Diſcovery, and their great Reverence to the Name, I do not underſtand that *Iſrael* did thereby conceive a diſtinction of *Perſons* in that *one* Eſſence held forth thereby. And I perceive the Author (my Reſpected Friend) laſt cited in his 108 and 109 *page*, when he paraphraſes on the word (tho he be a Diſciple of the Nicene Creed) yet notes not a diſtinction of *Perſons* directly and properly flowing, as the genuine ſenſe of this Word: But that properly and directly it imports and expreſſes the Divine Being with all the eſſential Properties. And the moſt that I can remember I ever read in any Author treating of this Word, amounted to no more but this, *viz.* That this ſacred Name of the moſt High, was the direct and proper Name of the Divine *Eſſence*, and all its inſeparable Properties, tho not excluding, yet not declaring, diſcovering or revealing it under a *threefold perſonal* ſubſiſting.

But further; when God *diſcovers* himſelf as the only Object of their Worſhip, prefixed in the fore-front of his Holy Law, *Exodus* 20. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Firſt, he declares himſelf by his name; *I am the Lord thy God:* Secondly, by his Works; *Which hath brought thee out of the Land of* Egypt. In the firſt Verſe is the Attribute of his Juſtice, and Severity againſt Sin: *I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, viſiting the Iniquity*, &c. The *6th* Verſe contains the Attribute of his Love: *Shewing Mercy unto thouſands of them that love me.* The Reſidue of the eſſential Properties were manifeſted in the Works firſt mentioned, viz. *bringing them out of* Egypt; where his Patience, his Pity, his Wiſdom, his Power were eminently ſhewn.

Methinks, as aforeſaid, if it had been the will of God that *Iſrael* his peculiar People ſhould have worſhipped him with the *Conception* of a *Trinity* in the *Act* of Adoration, that then he would, in this place *eſpecially*, have diſcovered ſomething thereof, ſince he is here more amply diſcovering his *Will* and their *Duty* than at any time heretofore. And yet here appears no ſuch thing; but rather ſtill the Object of Worſhip is diſcovered under the notion of a *ſingle Being*, I *am the Lord.* And this with his Works and Attributes, appears to be all the Deſcription of him.

Then again, at *Moſes* his repeating that which our Saviour calls the firſt and great Commandment, containing the principal part of Duty and Worſhip to this ſacred *Object*, the Preface runs thus, *Deut.* 6. 4. *Hear O* Iſrael, *the Lord our God is One Lord.*

Here indeed it is reaſonable to conclude that God intended his Subjects ſhould worſhip him under the notion, appellation, and conception of *One.* But who can think that by this he intended to teach them to do it under the notion and appellation of *three?*

Laſtly, as touching God's diſcovering of himſelf under the former Diſpenſation: Tho I confeſs when the words Holy *One* are uſed, they do not always particularly reſpect the moſt High, yet whenever they are uſed in holy Writ, as moſt proper, ſo they are always uſed to ſignify a *ſingle* Perſon. Now tho I ſhall not cite the particulars being too large, yet I promiſe to any that ſhall ſeriouſly deſire it, *thirty* ſeveral places in the Old Teſtament, where he is denominated the *Holy One*; and I can be better than my word. And on the other ſide, I challenge any body to ſhew me one place where he calls himſelf, or is called the *Holy Three:* and if ſo, it is a ſtrong preſumption at leaſt, that he would be worſhipped under the notion of a holy *One*, or *ſingle* Perſon.

And thus having run over ſome of the moſt principal places where God hath diſcovered himſelf to his Subjects, and collected them together, I conceive any indifferent Perſon, having firſt ſeriouſly peruſed them, will conclude

clude that any perſon having no other grounds to conceive a *Trinity* of perſons in this *one Eſſence* than what ariſes from thoſe Deſcriptions; it is not likely he ſhould be induced by thoſe Paſſages to conceive a *Trinity* of Perſons in this *one Eſſence* and Object.

Not that I hereby (as aforeſaid) *deny* the thing it ſelf, *viz.* the Doctrine of three Perſons; but ſhew that it is not likely that the Almighty doth *require* a particular Conception of *three* Perſons in the act of Worſhip, but only *one*; ſince he hath left the notion of *three* ſo very dark, as indeed not diſcernable, in thoſe *very* places where he diſcovers himſelf as the *Object* of Adoration: And hath choſen ſuch Epithets to declare himſelf generally and univerſally, as properly do infer a *ſingle* Eſſence not revealed, as ſubſiſting in *three* Somewhats, Manners, Modes, or Perſons.

And further, it is obſervable that the holy Scriptures ſpeaking of, and holding forth the *One* moſt High, do often repeat the Unity of his *ſingle* undivided Eſſence, as alſo the Greatneſs of his Power, his Wiſdom, and the Reſidue of his *Eſſential Properties:* they are found in multitudes of places in Scripture, as if Perſons could never enough be told, and made ſenſible of thoſe things, wherein all Parties are *agreed*; and as if they could never have too powerful conceptions of it in the Act of Worſhip. Methinks therefore it is ſtrange, that ſo eſpecial a point, as this is thought to be, ſhould be left ſo dark and obſcure, even to that degree that a man without any other help than thoſe Scriptures of the Old Teſtament (*of which now I ſpeak*) which ſpeak directly of the moſt High as the Object to be worſhipped; I ſay, may almoſt (if not altogether) as ſoon conceive in his mind *three hundred diſtinct Perſons* in this *Eſſence* as conceive *three*. What follows hence then but that that Perſon which ſincerely worſhips the moſt High, conceiving of him as ſubſiſting in *one* undivided Eſſence, in *one* Perſon, as we on all hands believe him to do, and worſhips him with ſuch Sentiments as he in conſcience thinks thoſe plain Paſſages before recited do naturally hold forth; what hinders, I ſay, but that we may think that he worſhips the moſt High aright, and according to the Scripture, altho he *diſtinguiſhes* not the Manners or Modes of his ſubſiſting? which indeed in it ſelf is ſomething hard to the unlearned at leaſt, to diſtinguiſh in their thoughts *three* diſtinct perſons, and not alſo at the ſame time to conceive *three real ſubſtantial* diſtinct Beings or Subſtances.

I therefore humbly conceive that thoſe that think they ought, and find they can in the act of Worſhip diſtinguiſh the Perſons, and not at the ſame time divide in their thoughts the Subſtance, I ſay let them *do ſo:* and they that think themſelves not obliged, and think they cannot well make this diſtinction in their thoughts, my opinion is, let them alone to ſerve God after the *old faſhion* that *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob* ſerved God in: And not for ſo ſmall a matter be ſtigmatized as Atheiſts, Denyers of the true God, Hereticks, and ſuch other infamous Characters, corrupting good Manners.

But in the next place: having ſhewn in the foregoing Diſcourſe how God hath manifeſted himſelf, I now in the ſecond place come to ſhew how, or in what manner the aforeſaid *Adam*, *Abraham*, *Jacob*, *Moſes*, and *Iſrael*, did conceive of the moſt High when they addreſſed themſelves unto him: which appears not to reſpect his ſubſiſting, but his *Eſſence* and eſſential Properties, which yet further confirms it, that either they were ignorant of a *threefold* ſubſiſting, or elſe did not think it expedient or neceſſary to contain it in their conceptions as a neceſſary part of, and in Divine Worſhip; This in general will appear, in that they always uſed ſuch Expreſſions as belong to the *ſingular* number, as *thee*, *thy*, *thou*, or *thine*; which ſhew that they did not directly pay their reſpects to *diſtinct* Perſons, but to *one Eſſence* without *diſtinction*; ſince we never read that they made uſe of *ye*, *you*, *your*, or *yours*.

But to make it more plain, we will examine the particular Inſtances. Firſt, *Adam*, Gen. 3. 10, 11. he ſaid, *I heard* thy *Voice*, *and the Woman whom* thou *gaveſt me*, &c. Next *Abraham*, Gen. 15. 2. *And* Abraham

ſaid,

ſaid, Lord God, what wilt thou *give me?* Chap. 17. 18. *O that* Iſmael *might live before* Thee! And when he would make his Servant ſwear by the *True* God, *Chap.* 24. 3. he did *not* diſtinguiſh him as *one in three*, but ſays he, *I will make thee ſwear by the Lord, the God of Heaven, and the God of the Earth!* Alſo when the Servant ſeveral times in this Chapter directs his Prayer to this God, he doth not diſtinguiſh him perſonally in *three*; but ſays, *O Lord God of my Maſter* Abraham, *I pray* thee *ſend me good ſpeed.* Then for *Jacob*, when he tells his Father *Laban* how his Subſtance came to be increaſed, *Gen.* 31. 42. he doth not ſay the God ſubſiſting in *three* Perſons, but ſays he, *the God of my Father, the God of* Abraham, *&c.* and Chap. 32. 10. *I am not worthy of the Mercies, and all the Truth which* Thou *haſt ſhewed me.* Ver. 11. *Deliver me I pray thee. And thou ſaidſt, I will ſurely do thee good.* In ſhort, in ſeveral places he diſtinguiſhes him *verbatim* as God diſcovered himſelf to *Abraham, viz.* God Almighty, but not one word of God in *three* Perſons. Next *Moſes*, Exodus 5. 23. *For ſince I came to* Pharaoh *to ſpeak in* Thy *Name, he hath done evil to this People. Neither haſt* Thou *delivered* thy *People at all.* Chap. 15. 1. *Then ſang* Moſes *and the Children of* Iſrael *this Song unto the Lord: He hath triumphed glorioufly, the Horſe and his Rider hath* He *thrown into the Sea.* And in this Song you have the Terms, *he, thee, thy, thou, thine, him*, repeated no leſs than 35 *times*, and yet neither *you, yours, they* or *them* once mentioned, reſpecting the moſt High. Thus have I briefly run over the ſum of the moſt remarkable Inſtances of perſons paying their Devotions to the moſt High in the Old Teſtament; and I might have inſtanced *David, Solomon, Daniel*, and many others, yea down to *Zechariah*'s days: and it appears as if they were all agreed to conceive of, and acknowledg an *undivided, ſingle Eſſence*, and its Properties. But no Footſteps do appear of their diſtinguiſhing the Eſſence in *three* perſons in their Conceptions. And if the Iſraelites ever had any ſuch conception of God, methinks it ſhould not be loſt; and if not loſt, it is ſtrange *Joſephus* ſhould not mention it, ſince he gives an account of things as far back as *Moſes*, even from the beginning; and often ſpeaks of God and his eſſential Properties, deſcribing the true Object of the Jews Worſhip, and yet always ſpeaks of him as *one* in *Unity* of *Eſſence*, but hints not a word of *divers* Perſons. And as *Joſephus* then, ſo the *Jews* now acknowledg no ſuch thing, as Mr. *Monk* ſays page 70. he ſays the Doctrine of the Trinity is contrary to the Blindneſs of the Jews, who do affirm an Eſſence altogether without *diſtinction*. Now, I ſay, 'tis ſtrange if this were underſtood amongſt them (eſpecially as ſo *material* a thing as is now ſuppoſed) that then both the Jews now (who yet profeſs the true God, and are zealous of the Moſaical Law) and *Joſephus* ſo long ago, ſhould yet be ignorant of ſo remarkable a matter.

In the next place, I come to the *New Teſtament*, to ſee whether we may judg it the Will of God that we ſhould worſhip and adore his Eſſence, as ſubſiſting in *one* Perſon, or in *three:* And firſt I will conſider the Apoſtle *Stephen*, what he ſays of the moſt High, *Acts* 7. 2. he calls him, *the God of Glory*; and ver. 32. he cites and deſcribes the antient Deſcription without enlarging, viz. *I am the God of* Abraham, and the God of *Iſaac, and* the God of *Jacob.* And ver. 48. *The moſt High dwells not in Temples made with Hands.* Herein is a diſcovery of God's Greatneſs, but no *diſtinguiſhing* his Perſons. And remarkable it is that *Paul* about to inſtruct the ignorant *Athenians* in the knowledg of the true God, as the Object of their Worſhip, *Acts* 17. 23, 24, 25. firſt lets them know that they ignorantly worſhipped the unknown God, and that *him* he would declare unto them: And accordingly ſays, *God that made the World, and all things therein, ſeeing that* he *is Lord of Heaven and Earth, dwells not in Temples made with mens hands, as though he needed any thing, ſeeing he giveth to all Life, and Breath, and all things.* Herein the Apoſtle very notably ſets forth his moſt glorious Attributes, and inviſible Being, by his creating and preſerving of all things: But ſays not one word of the *diſtinction* of Perſons. Now if the Knowledg of this were ſo neceſſary to be known

known in order to Salvation as is imagined; *Paul* had no less need to instruct these ignorant *Athenians* therein, as much as in the knowledg of the *Essential* Properties and Power. Next we will consider *Eph.* 4. 6. *There is One God and Father of all, who is above all.* Here you see a plain discovery of the *Unity* of the Godhead, and his Supremacy, but the *Description* of Persons is still wanting. To this I will add 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *But to us there is but* One God, *the Father of all things.* Here again the Object of Worship is described as the first Cause and Foundation of all things (*of whom are all things.*) 2. The Inseparableness and *Oneness* of his Being is asserted (but *One* God.) 3. He is so far from directing us to fix our Conceptions on him, as distinguished into *three* Persons, that he solely centers him in *One*, even as subsisting in the *Father*. Now what rational Man can conclude from hence, but that we are to conceive of the Object of Worship as intirely subsisting in, and to be called by the Appellation of the *Father*, and so to be worshipped? That is, in plainness, that we are to conceive that all that we believe to be God most High, whether Essence, Attributes, or Persons, whatever we may think of its various subsisting in our *selves*, yet it is to be adored and distinguished by the Person of the *Father*; where we all say that 'tis *all and whole*.

But further, I shall add the Authority of him who cannot err. John 4. 22, 23, 24. *Te worship ye know not what: We know what we worship; for Salvation is of the Jews.——But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true Worshippers shall worship the* Father *in Spirit and in Truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him, must worship Him in Spirit and in Truth.*

From this pertinent place I note as follows; First, That it contains a Discourse of our Saviour *directly* concerning Worship: 1. Blaming and describing the ignorant *false* Worshippers; *Te, the Samaritans, worship ye know not what.* 2. Describing the true Worshippers: 1. By the manner how, *in Spirit and in Truth.* 2. The Matter or Object what; and that described two ways: *1st.* His *Essence*, a Spirit: *2dly.* The *Person* who, *viz.* the *Father*; *the true Worshippers shall worship the Father.* Further, from this Text I observe; 1. They cannot be true Worshippers that worship they know not what. 2. They that worship the Father as the proper Object of Divine Worship, are not such as worship they know not what, but such as know what they worship. 3. They that worship the Father, conceiving of him, as containing the glorious inseparable Essence or Spirit, being worthy above all things to be worshipped; these I say are not the false, but the *true* Worshippers of God; and provided they perform their Worship spiritually, shall be accepted by him, because he seeks such to worship him. 4. That it is the Will of God, and Direction of Christ, that of all the Persons believed to be in the Deity, God the *Father* is to be conceived as the most proper *Person* for us to direct our highest Adoration to. 5. That he that conceives that the Godhead, and all its essential Properties, subsist in the Father as the proper Object of Divine Worship, conceives not amiss; because, according to Christ's Rule, he is a *true* Worshipper. 6. That we may lawfully have Communion with any such Persons, if that be all their fault, because they are true Worshippers, and with better we cannot well join. 7. I observe that when Christ describes the Object of our Worship, he is so far from distinguishing or teaching us to distinguish the Persons in that Object, that he contains all under the denomination of *one only* Person, even the *Father*.

Next I shall cite the Instruction of our Lord, expresly injoining us to *pay* Adoration to God the *Father*, and acknowledg all to be his. *Mat.* 6. 9. *After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father who art in Heaven, hallowed be* thy *Name*; thy *Kingdom come*; thy *Will be done in Earth as 'tis in Heaven, &c.* ——*for* thine *is the Power and the Glory for ever.* Amen. From this I observe: 1. That it is the Will of God, as declared by Christ, that the order we should observe in our Conceptions of God Almighty, and in pouring out our Desires to him, is positively and directly to pray to God the *Father*, as the proper Appellation and Object of our Prayers. 2. That he that prays to God the Father, prays in that respect *aright*, and to the *true* God. 3. That it appears not that in our Prayers we are *injoined* to distinguish the Persons, if we regard and eye by Faith the Being or Essence we worship: 1. Because, if such a thing as distinguishing the Persons in Prayer were a Duty, or material, our Saviour would have inserted it in his Directory, since he here gives an account of all the material Points of Prayer. 2. Because on the contrary he expresly injoins us to direct our Desires (not to *three*, but) to *one* Person, even the *Father*; withal teaching us to use such Expressions as are most proper to a *single Person*, *viz.* three times

thy, and once *thine*. 4. I observe that our Lord directs us to render and ascribe such Excellency, full Power, Soveraignty, Protection, Sacredness, Bounty, Clemency, Glory to the Father, as are only proper to be given to the *whole* and only *Godhead*; which still shews that the proper glorious Object of Divine Worship is the whole Godhead, as truly subsisting *all* and *whole* in the Person of the *Father*, and under that Appellation to be worship'd. And as I have hitherto treated of positive Directions in this case, I shall briefly cite some Examples of Christ and his Apostles, as our Pattern to follow, whereby it may further appear most agreeable to Scripture to worship *one* Person. First, Christ's Example, *Mat.* 11.25. *I thank* thee, *O* Father, Lord *of Heaven and Earth*. Here he pays the duty of Thankfulness to the Father, and owns him as *supreme* Soveraign. Mark 14.36. *And he said, Abba*, Father; *all things are possible to* thee, *take away this Cup from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as* thou *wilt*. Next I shall cite the Apostles: *Rom.* 8.15. *Ye have received the Spirit of Adoption, whereby ye cry*, Abba, *Father*. Rom. 15.6. *That ye may with one Mind —glorify God, even the* Father *of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Gal. 4.6. *God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your Hearts, crying*, Abba, *Father*. The next Instance shall be the Adoration of *Paul* to this *single* Person; *Eph.* 3.14. *For this cause I bow my Knee to the* Father *of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Jam. 3.9. *Therewith bless we God, even the* Father. 1 Pet. 1.17. *And if ye call on the* Father, *&c.* And indeed it were tedious to cite all those Texts that give Testimony to this thing. These Gleanings are set down, that ye might believe that the proper Object of Divine Worship is the *one* most High God, as truly subsisting *all and whole* in the Person of the *Father*: And believing it, that ye might direct your Adoration to him accordingly, and also have Charity towards all those who have no other material fault but worshipping the *Father* as the proper Object. Nay, methinks there is no Point of Divinity in the Holy Scriptures more clear than this thing, as any indifferent Eye may see: 'tis not a thing drawn from *doubtful Consequences*; but plainly revealed, often repeated, and never contradicted, but confirmed by the universal Practice of the Prophets and Primitive Saints, and also by Christ and the Apostles; namely, That the most High is to be worshipped as a single *impartible* Essence, *in one single Person*, without the Worshippers being obliged at the same time to distinguish *three* distinct Subsistings and Denominations.

And on the other side, there is not *one* Instance to be given where any Man is recorded in the word of God, our *only* Rule and Guide, to adore the most High God under the apprehension of one Essence in *three* Persons; that is, I mean, did direct his Prayers or Thanks to *three* Persons. And here I must take occasion moderately to check some of my worthy and beloved Brethren, useful in the Ministry, who a little heated with an inordinate Zeal for the Doctrine of *three* Persons in the Godhead, fearing they may prejudice the Doctrine it self by yielding too much to its opposite, do on the other side as much overshoot the Mark, and form their Petitions quite beyond all Scripture-Injunction and Example. And tho no Examples, nor any thing like them can be given, yet they must conclude their Prayers, To thee, *O Lord, Father, Son, and holy Spirit, three Persons, one eternal God*, be Honour, Glory, Praise, *&c.* What shall one think of this, but that those Men think if they should not direct and form their Prayers to the Almighty, *better* than *Abraham, Jacob, Moses*, the Prophets of old, and *Christ* and his Apostles did, their Prayers would be very *defective*, and not accomplished as they ought? Truly, to be zealous in a good thing is commendable; and that's a good thing for which we have *Precept or Pattern*: but for this there is neither. Now when we take the liberty to add to Divine Worship, however agreeable to our Opinions, and however well-meaning our Intentions may be, yet if our Device want Authority from sacred Record, we mar instead of mending: for as there is a time for every Purpose, so is there a Rule for every Practice. God is the God of Order, and the supreme Giver of a Rule in all Institutions and Worship: and when beyond the express Rule, we shall foist in any Formality in Duty, we cast Dishonour on them of old, to wit, the Prophets and Apostles, yea Christ and God himself, as if he had been short in giving sufficient Rules, or Christ and his Followers short in understanding him. And thus endeavouring to mend, Formality, beyond Rule, or express Precept or Example, has (as I hinted before) occasioned all or most of the Innovations in Institutions and Forms of Divine Worship: As for example, because Christ saith, *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of God, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you*; therefore as if persons were bound to take more care for their Children than God himself directed, for many Ages they gave them the Lord's Supper, tho they had no express Scripture for it. Likewise because the Apostle

says,

says, *Make melody to the Lord, and rejoice; and again I say, rejoice*, and the like; therefore without our rule some have invented Organs, as proper to heighten Rejoycings. Likewise because the Scripture saith, *Confess your Faults one to another*; therefore the Roman Church hath invented Auricular Confession. And truly tho I would be sparing in comparisons, yet I would have all my Brethren see that it is *dangerous* to add *Devices* of our own; and that it is hardly sufficient, because the Scripture says, *There are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one*; that *therefore* we must say in our Prayers, *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, three Persons, and one eternal God*; when we have no precedent that ever any did so, who yet knew how to pray as well as we, having the first Fruits of the Spirit. And, as I said before, were the distinction of Persons in that one Essence as plainly discovered by Scripture and Reason, as the Oneness of that Godhead is (which yet I must confess it hardly is) yet the manner of our Conceptions and our Expressions to, and Appellations of the Object of Worship in the Act of Worship, must depend upon God's *Will*, and Christ's *Direction*, and not our *own* Device.

And now, according to my promise, concerning the Knowledg of the most High, and paying Worship to him, I hope I have convincingly shewn the joint Agreement on all hands among the Parties above-mentioned, and that at most there is but a circumstantial difference between them; and no material one seems to be in their thoughts either concerning God or Worship unto him, both believing in the very *same* God that created the Heavens and Earth, the very *same* Essence all and whole, the *very same* that was and is the God of *Abraham, Isaac*, and *Jacob*, the *same* God and no other that is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus, the very same God that Christ directs us to call Father, owning all his essential Properties, Power, and Prerogatives, each believing him to subsist all and *whole* in the person of the *Father*, and under that Appellation most *proper* to be worshipped; only there is a little difference about this *threefold* manner of subsisting, a thing (as has him shewn) that God and Christ have at *least* been *sparing* in declaring at any time, when he made discovery of himself in all Ages. And therefore I hope the Belief of it not to be look'd upon so *binding*, or the ignorance of it so *damning*, as to be *the Test of Communion*.

And now, according to my promise, I shall come to speak of the second Person of the Trinity, *viz.* the Christ of God.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the Christ of God.

THIS Chapter containeth four Sections: First, shewing that we are all agreed about the Person of Christ, who he is.

The second treateth of his Offices, therein also shewing that we are agreed.

The third answers this Question, Whether or no it be required, that in order to our right believing in, and worshipping of the Person of *Jesus of Nazareth*, we must worship him as the most High God.

The fourth treateth particularly of his human Nature.

Sect. I. *Shewing that we are all agreed about the Person of Christ, who he is.*

GReat have been the Mistakes of many about the *Person* of the *Messias*. There seem to be in all Nations such Sparks of Light as inform them they have need of some one to be their Friend to appease Divine Wrath, and speak to the most High for them; to which purpose the Jews adhered to one *Benchosbab* in the Reign of *Adrian*, who pretended to be the *Messias*, but came to nothing. Likewise in 1666, they followed one *Sebastius Sevi*. And after that one *More* pretending to be Christ, who both came to nothing. And they now look for a *Messias* to come that is not *Jesus of Nazareth*. The Persians rely on *Haly*, the Turks on *Mahomet*; and the Quakers say it is somewhat *within*, *viz.* a Spirit, or spiritual Substance. And

there shall yet come (especially in the last times) many Pretenders, calling themselves Christs, which shall be found Liars.

But our Brethren and we all agree that he and no other, that was born of *Mary*, called *Jesus of Nazareth*, nailed to the Cross by the order of *Pontius Pilat*, in the days of *Tiberius Cesar*; that he, I say, was, and is the *Christ of God, the Saviour of the World*. And why we should cry out upon one another, that such a one denies the true Christ, and believes in another Christ, I see no Reason, since we all agree that that one Person, born of *Mary*, was, and is the true Christ. 'Tis true, their Sentiments and ours may not be alike about his Substance, in his preexisting before his Incarnation: but as that is a Mystery hard for the Ignorant to understand, and Men of the greatest Parts commonly lose themselves in it; so I do not find the Apostles press it as material to be believed in, and understood: their main design seemed to be to prove, that he was the *same* Person the Prophets spake of; and to open the Power and Efficacy of his Death and Sufferings; but were very sparing in talking of his preexisting; which yet if it had been necessary to Salvation, it seems to me they would have opened it as well as other Points. But supposing our Brethren mistaken in their Conceptions concerning Christ, what he was before his Incarnation; yet have they the same Respect and Love for his Person as we have, believe him to be the *very* Christ of God as much as we, believe his Death to be available, and look upon him to be as sufficient a *Saviour* as we do; and since they pitch on the very same Person that we do, I cannot think that they believe in a false, or *another* Christ.

Sect. II. *Concerning the Offices of Christ, shewing also that we are therein agreed.*

HIS Name *Jesus* signifies a Saviour, and *Christ* is in English, Anointed; so that this Person we speak of, is the Anointed of God to save Mankind: His principal Office is to mediate between the *most High offended*, and the *Lump of Men offending*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. Now concerning his Mediatorship, our Brethren and we agree, both believing that he is truly Man, having the Actions and Passions of Men, as eating, drinking, sleeping, *&c.* And that he had a reasonable Soul; that he is to be accounted our Prophet, Priest, and King; that his Death and Bloodshed is sufficient to ransom the World; that there is no Remission of Sins without him; that he now sits at the right hand of the most High; that he shall one day judg the Quick and Dead; that he has now all Authority in Heaven and Earth; that he is the true Son of God; that he is above the Angels; that his Flesh is the true Heavenly Bread; that whosoever eats thereof shall live for ever; that his Blood received by Faith is Drink indeed; that he bare our Sins in his own Body on the Tree. In these things touching the *Person and Offices of Christ*, and in other material Points of like nature, there is an Agreement; and why there should be such a falling out, I cannot guess, unless thro Pride we will have all Men see as we see, and in such things as seem not to be preached by the Apostles as necessary.

Sect. III. *Treating on, and answering this Question: Whether or no we are required, in order to our right believing in, and worshipping of the Person of* Jesus *of* Nazareth, *to worship him as the most High God?*

BEfore I come directly to answer this Question, I shall first speak of the Worship and Adoration due to him, as he is the Christ of God, and in *that* Capacity (to be sure) *subordinate* and subject to the Father. Now I think it is on all hands allowed, that Glory and Honour is to be given to Christ, as he is the Mediator. And the Reason why all Glory, and such Honour is to be given to him, is, because [illegible] in Heaven and in Earth is given to him, [illegible]. Now I observe that Divine Honour is never to be given to the most High because of a Power given him; for the most High gives all things, but no Power or Authority can be *given* to him; he has it all originally in himself. Now the Power *here* spoken of, was a Power *given* unto him; therefore he had it *not* as most High, but as Christ, a confessed Subject, and received it of the Father.

Moreover, it is said, John 5. 22, 23. *For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all Judgment unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.* And vers. 26. *For as the Father hath Life in himself, so hath he given unto the Son to have Life in himself.* From hence I note, that there is an Honour to be given to Christ, as to one in-

inveſted with Power by and from another; and that God the Father hath given and beſtowed on him Power and Judgment, partly on purpoſe that Men ſhould pay him this Honour.

And tho Compariſons, as we uſe to ſay, will not run on all four; yet for Illuſtration ſake I will inſtance the Caſe of *Joſeph*: *Pharaoh* was King, yet ſays he to *Joſeph*, Gen. 41. 40. *Thou ſhalt be over my Houſe; and according unto thy Word ſhall all my People be ruled: ſee I have ſet thee over all the Land of Ægypt; and they cried before him, Bow the Knee.* A Badg of Homage and Honour very probably given to the King when he rode amongſt the People.

Here you ſee, tho *Pharaoh* were King, yet the Execution of the Power, and the Honour of the Government is given unto *Joſeph*. So altho the Father, or the Moſt High, be he that hath Authority originally, yet the Honour of it, and the execution of it in Heaven and in Earth is given unto the Son, and he ſhall keep it and execute it until he hath ſubdued all his Enemies, and then ſhall deliver it up to God, even the Father: 1 *Cor.* 15. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. Now about this Honour and Power there is no Controverſy that I know of, every one of either Party granting that Chriſt hath not this Power and Honour, as he is eſſentially God moſt High, becauſe then he could not receive it, nor yet ever deliver it up again, as in all plainneſs he is ſaid to do. And this kind of Advancement, and Power, and Prerogative is intended, *Epheſ.* 1. 20, 21, 22. where it is ſaid, *God hath ſet him far above all Principalities, and Powers, and Might, and Dominion, and every Name that is named, not only in this World, but alſo in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his Feet.* The like is mentioned and intended, Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11. *Wherefore God alſo hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every Name: That at the Name of* Jeſus *every Knee ſhould bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth; and that every Tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.* The like alſo is intended *Heb.* 2. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. and in many other places is this kind of Dignity ſpoken of. But, as aforeſaid, this matter is not controverted; but the Knot of the Queſtion is, Whether *over and above* this Honour, which is to be given unto him as Chriſt, and a principal Officer and Repreſentative of the moſt High; I ſay, whether *over and above* this Honour we are not bound to worſhip him as the moſt High himſelf: that is, not as one deſerving Honour and Obedience becauſe of Dignity and Power given him, but as one deſerving and requiring it, having *originally* all Power and Dignity dwelling *eſſentially* in him, and he the only ſupream Giver of it to others.

To this weighty Queſtion, with all Modeſty and Submiſſion to better Judgments (from whom, if occaſion be, I expect Information) I humbly anſwer, No; that ſuch Worſhip is not formally to be paid to the *Perſon* of *Chriſt* as he is the Chriſt of God.

Miſtake me not; let none ſuppoſe that I hereby deny the Perſon of Chriſt to be eſſentially God: But I ſay, allowing that, yet it follows not from thence that we are to pay our Devotion to Chriſt as to the moſt High.

My Reaſons for it are as follows: Firſt, Becauſe when the Apoſtles preached and diſcovered him unto the World, they ſeem to diſcover and preach no ſuch Belief and Practice.

And firſt, for *Peter*'s firſt Sermon to the Multitude, *Act.* 2. which cauſed the Plantation of the firſt Chriſtian Church: he preaches Salvation through the name of Chriſt, verſ. 21. he let them know that *Jeſus* of *Nazareth* was no Impoſtor, but a man approved of God by Miracles, Wonders, and Signs, ver. 22. he ſpeaks of his Death and Sufferings, ver. 23. his Reſurrection, v. 24. his Exaltation, ver. 33. and v. 36. concludes, *Know aſſuredly that God hath made the ſame Jeſus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Chriſt.*

Here you ſee *Peter* omits no material thing: he ſpeaks of his Merits; They that call on him ſhall be ſaved: his Death, Reſurrection, Exaltation, receiving Empire and Honour; God hath made him Lord: but not one word of his being *eſſentially* God, and ſo on that account the Object of Divine Wor-

Worſhip; which yet, had it been ſo materrial a Point as is now thought, did *deſerve* as much to be preached as any of the other. Likewiſe in his ſecond Sermon *Acts* 3. he preaches Chriſt from Verſ. 13. to the end; yet not one word of his being *eſſentially* the moſt High. The like is to be obſerved in the fourth Chapter. Many places I might run over, but for brevity ſake I ſhall only take notice of two more: one is where *Peter* is ſent to tell *Cornelius* what he ought to believe and do, *Acts* 10. verſ. 36. he lets *Cornelius* know that Jeſus was Lord, as before he told the Jews, *God had made him both Lord and Chriſt*: He tells him that God had ſent the Meſſage of Peace by him, he tells him he was the Anointed of God; he tells him he was a Miracle-Worker, which ſhewed that God was with him: he tells him of his Death and Reſurrection: he teſtifies him to be the *ſame* the Prophets propheſied of to come: he preaches Remiſſion of Sins through Faith in his Name: he declares him to be ordained Judg of Quick and Dead; but not one word that he is to be worſhipped as eſſentially God Moſt High; which had it been a point of *Faith*, would ſurely have been told *Cornelius* and the Gentiles. Likewiſe when *Paul* informs the *ignorant* Athenians, *Acts* 17. 31. after he had deſcribed the true God, he deſcribes Chriſt *diſtinct* from God as the *ordained* Judg of the World, but ſpeaks not of his *Godhead*.

My ſecond Reaſon is, Becauſe as he is Chriſt he is *diſtinguiſhed* from God, and an Officer under him: and therefore *ſo as* he is Chriſt to be believed in, ſaying of himſelf, his *Father* is *greater* than he, and than all, the Scriptures that direct us in our Faith in Chriſt, direct us to underſtand his *Office*; but ſeem to be ſilent concerning his *Eſſence*: Neither doth Chriſt any where *require* us to worſhip him as the moſt High; but we are to pray, to give thanks, and perform our Homage to the moſt High through Jeſus Chriſt, as the new and living way conſecrated for us.

But thirdly, *nothing* is Chriſt but what is *anointed*, (for Chriſt in plain Engliſh ſignifies *anointed*.) Now the Divine *Eſſence* was not anointed nor *incarnate*; for who ſhould *anoint* it, unleſs we will ſay the Divine *Eſſence* anointed the Divine *Eſſence* with the Divine *Eſſence*? Some will ſay that that is abſurd; and verily except we have a mind to fall into the contradictory ridiculous Opinion of the Quakers, I think we can plead at moſt for no more than this, *viz.* that the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity was incarnate and anointed, and not the Divine Eſſence it ſelf: And if ye will not believe me, believe Mr. *Tho. Monck*, in his Cure for the cankering Error, pag. 98. where he tells you, we always diſtinguiſh betwixt the *Eſſence* of the Son and the Perſon; ſaying, the *Eſſence* is one with the Father, but not his *Perſon*: Therefore we ſay his Perſon was begotten, not his Eſſence; and we alſo ſay his Perſon took Fleſh of the Virgin *Mary*, not his Eſſence; and therefore it was the *Perſon* of the *Son* that was born of her, not the *Father*, nor the Spirit; for tho the Eſſence of the three be one, yet the Perſons be diſtinct: and pag. 114. he reckons up the Abſurdities will elſe follow, *viz.* that the Father was he that took Man's Nature upon him, was tempted of the Devil, ſuffered Hunger and Thirſt, was buffeted and ſcourged of the Jews, and put to death by wicked hands; is greater than himſelf, ſent himſelf into the World: he gave himſelf a Seat at his own Right Hand; he is the expreſs Image of himſelf, *&c.* and many other Abſurdities he reckons up; theſe may ſuffice.

Now I humbly conceive Divine Homage and Adoration is to be given to the *Eſſence* of the moſt High, and not to a particular manner of its *ſubſiſting*; to wit, to a Perſon, which yet is all which is or was anointed (according to Mr. *Monck*'s Opinion.)

But then I know it will be ſaid that each *Perſon*, and ſo the ſecond Perſon, contains in it all the *Eſſence*. Let it be ſo, I will allow that in the Perſon of *Chriſt* dwelt all the Fulneſs of the Godhead bodily, according to *Col.* 2. 9. But then it muſt alſo be allowed that the Eſſence dwelt there as ſomething *diſtinct* from the Anointed, and not as the Anointed it ſelf: It muſt alſo be allowed that the moſt High dwelt in Chriſt *incognito*, as ſome great Princes appear in foreign Courts and

and Places *incognito*, that is, tho they are personally present, yet they decline to receive those Royal and Princely Honours due to their Character; receiving them only or chiefly in their Palace Royal. So tho the Almighty dwell in the Person of Christ, yet we are not taught to say, our Father who art in the *Person of Christ*, but our Father who art in *Heaven*; which Expression he desires we should use while the Person of Christ was on Earth. And we have before shewn that we are to worship the Divine *Essence*, as subsisting all and whole in the Person of the *Father*; neither are we any where commanded or directed to say, our *Son* who art in Heaven, or our *Spirit* who art in Heaven, hallowed be thy Name; but only our *Father*.

And since the *Divine Essence* seems not to desire us to worship him under the *Denomination*, or in the *Person* of the *Son*, I think it safest for us to worship him as truly and wholly subsisting in the Person of the *Father*, and under that Denomination.

Besides, the Names of Son and Spirit, howsoever with respect of *Essence* they are believed to be God; yet I say these Names seem to distinguish them from God, and do denote them as Officers under God. Therefore it is said the *Father* is greater than I, and than all: the Son knows not the Day and Hour of Judgment, but the Father only.

Likewise the *Spirit* when he comes, he shall not speak of himself; but what he hears that shall he speak.

From the whole I conclude, that the Christ of God ought in our Faith concerning him to be distinguished from God himself; and that whatever may be said of the Divine *Essence* dwelling in Christ, yet nothing was *Christ* but what was anointed; and that only the Person was anointed, or was incarnate, according to Mr. *Monck*'s Opinion.

And further, that whatever Divine *Essence* dwelt in Christ, or was Christ; yet the proper place to pay Adoration to it, is in the Person of the Father, and that he that worships the Father, worships all the Divine Essence under the proper Name and Appellation under which it should be worshipped, to wit that of the *Father*.

These things considered, I see no reason why we should so stigmatize our Brethren, because they worship the most High under the proper Name and Person that they ought; and do not use improper Names to do it by, as our *Son* who art in Heaven, or our *Christ* who art in Heaven, or our *Spirit* who art in Heaven; since those Names or Persons, whatsoever their Essence be, do not require us to worship the most High in them; but to understand and improve the Knowledg of their Office; and remember that that Person who was nailed to the Cross, who cried our, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? was the Mediator betwixt God and us, the very Christ, the anointed, who did never require his Disciples to worship him as the most High.

SECT. IV.

Treating particularly of his Human Nature.

AS touching the Contention about the *human* Nature of Christ, strange it is to me, (and would have been stranger, had I not once dipped my Fingers in the same folly) that Men so well agreeing in the main substantial Points of the Faith of Christ, should yet notwithstanding so teaze one another about a Circumstance so dark as this is: They all believe that his Body was the true *Son*, and sent of God, that he was a real Man, that he was a sufficient Sacrifice and Saviour: But all this will not satisfy them, except they know what he was made of; yet the Scripture leaves it so, that if we make any determination, we must bring the plain Words to our meaning; for as it is said, he

was

was made of the Seed of *David* according to the Flesh, it is also as expresly said, the Word was made Flesh, *John* 1. 14. And *Solomon* the wisest of Men, and the greatest Searcher into Nature's Secrets that ever was, says, Who do know how the Bones do grow in the Womb of her that is with Child? speaking of an ordinary Conception.

If an ordinary Conception be so dark then, much more this Conception of our Lord, which was beyond, and contrary to the Course of *Nature:* Therefore to make the Ignorance thereof so damning, and the certain Knowledg of it the Test of Communion, seems to savour of *Presumption*; and it is something pleasant to see old grave men discoursing so seriously and learnedly how far any Woman contributes towards any Child conceived in her; a thing so intricate, that the most famous Philosophers have been at Daggers Draw about it: and when any man hath thought his Thought about it, he may be right, and he may be wrong, because we are all left without light to travel in those Paths.

For my part I intend not to follow them in this Discourse or Controversy, the whole appearing to me, and to many others, to be *needless*; since tho it must be granted that somebody is, and must needs be mistaken, and under Misapprehensions in the case, yet the Mistakes are not so *pernicious* to lead the mistaken to question whether this be the true Messias, promised to *Adam*, and all along prophesied of by the Prophets; but they, whoever they be, are very confident, as well as the other, that this is the true Christ; therefore pray why all this stir? this *Jehu*-like driving seems not to savour much of a true Christian Spirit. But I shall conclude this Section with a Comparison for illustration of my meaning, which I have heretofore frequently made use of, sometimes with good success, in Discourses of this kind.

We will imagine two Persons, *A* and *B*, Servants to *C*, do grow refractory, and run away from *C*, and deservedly in their rambles are taken by the Enemy, and made Slaves of in a foreign Land, help themselves they cannot; but *C* hearing, and well understanding their Misfortune and Misery, notwithstanding their former Ingratitude, yet pities them, and sends by a trusty hand a sufficient Ransom to redeem them, and obtain their Liberty.

The Ransom arrives, and they are accordingly redeemed, and presently embark to go home to *C*; as they sail homeward, (they being, as well they may be, much affected with their Liberty) they are often discoursing concerning their Ransom, they both agree, and question not that it was none of their Deserts, but the free Love and Bounty of *C* was the cause of the Ransom's being sent; neither do they question in the least whether or no it be come, or being come, whether it be sufficient; for in all this they are satisfied: But in their Discourse it happens this Question is dropt; that is Whether the Ransom was Gold or Silver? *A* thinks he hath sufficient Reasons to believe it was Silver; and *B* thinks he hath as sound Reasons to believe it was Gold: they terribly inforce their Arguments on both sides, and possibly neither of them both certainly know the truth of the matter, or have any infallible or certain Rule to know, yet they are both very confident; one says, he is sure he is in the right, and he is sure the other is in the wrong. And so after they have vexed and teaz'd one another more than enough, the Contention at last arises so high, that *A* will stay no longer in the same Ship with *B*, but will leave him, and sail in some other Ship; nay stay, says *B*, do not leave me, since I love you, and we are agreed in the main things, and do find, thanks be to *C*, that the Ransom was sufficient; and why should we part about this *Circumstance*, especially since we were both Partners in Slavery and Misery, and were both made happy and set at liberty by this one Ransom? and since we are both Strangers in this Country, neither is there any in the Ship speak the same Language that we do, let us enjoy the Comfort of each others Society, and be helpful one to another in Advice and Discourse; who knows, being amongst Strangers and Enemies, how we may need each others help? and consider how comfortable

fortable it will be for us, that have been loving Friends and Companions and Fellow-Country-men, to talk together in our own Language, while thoſe Barbarians gabble in an unknown Tongue, and barbarous Language? Therefore pray do not leave me, but tarry with me. Ay ſays *A*, if you'l ſay as I ſay, and think as I think, that the Ranſom was Silver, I'll tarry with you then, and all ſhall be well; but if you will not ſay ſo, I am reſolved I'll be gone, I'll keep you company no longer, nor I'll regard nor take no more account of you than of one of thoſe Strangers and Infidels from whence you come; nay you are full out as bad as they, or rather the worſt of the two; you deſerve, if you had your Deſert, to be *curſed* out of my Company.

Says *B*, theſe are hard Words, and ſo much the harder coming from one I ſo much eſteem, and for ſo ſmall an occaſion: Howbeit, I am not by any of your Arguments convinced that you are right; I cannot ſay as you ſay, I think ſtill the Ranſom was Gold; nevertheleſs, tho I think you are *miſtaken*, I can and will bear with you, pray ſhake hands, and be Friends, and bear with me; pray don't leave me, our parting will be very pernicious and uncomfortable, and thoſe Barbarians in the Ship will take notice of it, and check us with it, and every body will wonder at it; and which is worſt, *C* that ſent the Ranſom, and did us ſo much good, will know of it, and be very much offended with us: therefore pray be perſwaded to tarry with me. No not I, ſays *A*, I am reſolved I'll be gone, and I'll print ſome Papers, and expoſe you, and I'll put a Bear's Skin upon you; and if I can, I'll make all them in the Ship believe that you are a Bear indeed, and all the Dogs in the Ship ſhall bark at you, that you ſhall have but little Comfort or Peace in your Voyage; and ſo in the mind I am in, I'll never come at you more, or bid you God ſpeed, and ſo adieu.

Away flings *A* in a great Heat, down ſits *B*, fetching a deep Sigh, and becomes exceeding melancholy, that he muſt ſail alone. Now every body will be ready to think that this was a very untoward, ſcurvy, ſimple Trick of *A*, for ſo ſlight an occaſion to deal ſo with *B*, and leave him, thereby expoſing both himſelf and *B* to the odd Cenſure and Deriſion of the By-ſtanders. Yet what do ſome wiſe Men do leſs than the ſame thing?

While both Parties in this Controverſy were running from God, and taken captive under Sin and Wrath, and were unable to help themſelves, God ſaw and pitied their Condition, and freely ſends his Son to ranſom and redeem them to the glorious Liberty of the Sons of God; he accordingly offers his Body, and redeems them from Sin and Wrath; they both without *doubting* do agree that contrary to their Deſerts God freely ſent his Son, and that *Jeſus of Nazareth* was he, and that he was a ſufficient Ranſom. But at the ſame time the Queſtion is dropt, what was that Body made of? ſays one Party, all that died on the Croſs to redeem us was originally a *Creature of the Earth*, of the Duſt of the Ground: No, ſays ſome of the other Parties, that which died for our Sins, tho it were a real and true *natural* Man, yet originally was not of the Duſt of the Ground, nor a part of the *polluted fallen Lump*, but of a more noble Extract, to wit, the Lord from Heaven: And amongſt other things, it is ſaid they think ſo for this reaſon; becauſe if the moſt High could honourably with reſpect to his *Juſtice*, take any part of the fallen Lump, and ſanctify it, and accept of it without any Mediator or Sacrifice offered for it; nay ſo accept of it not ony in its own behalf, but alſo as a Ranſom ſatisfactory for all the reſt of that Lump; then it will follow that there was no abſolute neceſſity for the ſatisfaction of Juſtice that there ſhould be any Mediator at all, ſince it appears that a part of that fallen Lump was accepted without any Mediator at all; but I'll not meddle with the *Controverſy*. In the mean time the other Party repreſented by *A* in our Similitude, ſay, except you ſay as we ſay, and think as we think, that that which died was of the Earth, we will leave you, and reject you as *Hereticks*: No ſays the

other Party represented by *B*, not so, we are your Brethren, we love you, pray don't part from us, we live in the love of Christ; we own the same Person to be Christ that you do; we believe him to be as sufficient a Ransom as you do; we believe him to be the Son of God as well as you, only we think in this matter you are mistaken; yet we are willing to bear with you, and embrace you. If you leave us, God will be *offended*, good men *grieved*, young Converts *staggered*, and the World will *laugh* at us, and scoff us. No, says the other Party represented by *A*, we will leave you, say what you will, you deserve no Charity nor Indulgence, you ought to be *excommunicated*, if you had your due: We will expose you in printed Papers; we will perswade every body, if we can, that you are Bugbears: we say you are no *Christians*; you hold such Heresies as are sufficient to corrupt all the Churches, and to root the Christian Religion out of the World: You are worse than the *Papist*, and as bad as *Atheists*; nay you do deny the true God, and the Lord that bought you; you will bring on your selves swift Destruction; and therefore we will purge our selves of you, and so adieu.

Lamentable it is, and to be bewailed, that they who should strive together for the Faith of the Gospel, should strive to wound their Brethrens Reputation, representing them as the worst of Men: surely brotherly Compassion, and brotherly Communion, with a friendly and charitable Bearing, would be to the Gospel much more adorning, in our selves much more becoming, and to our Brethren much more edifying. Let us live in the Love of God, and keep pure the Doctrines of Christ, leaving those Mysteries till we shall know as we are known. There is one thing more I had almost slipt: some will say our Brethren own Christ to be the Son of God; but that signifies little, so long as they do not tell us how he is the Son of God. To which I answer, That it is unjust to condemn them for what we our selves are guilty of: for there is none of us all, while we tell them of Eternal Generation, that dare once open our Mouths to tell them how it is. And while they say Eternal Generation is against Reason, we say it is above Reason, and cannot be comprehended by Reason. 'Tis true we tell them by the Pen of Mr. *Monk*, pag. 72. That the *Person* begets, and is begotten, but the *Essence* neither begetteth, nor is begotten; and pag. 98. we say his *Person* was begotten, not his *Essence*. But some will say we have no Scripture says so; and do what we can, yet some young Converts, ignorant Persons, and those of mean apprehension, tho they may be honest-hearted Men and Women, yet in this case are so dull of hearing, that they'l hardly ever understand it.

But enough of this. I shall now in the next place come to treat of the Holy Spirit, the third Person of the Holy Trinity.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the Holy Spirit.

I Shall do little more in this Chapter, than transcribe what I have wrote on this Subject almost ten years ago in a private Letter, which yet hath been made considerably publick in *Kent*, *London*, and elsewhere; and having yet received no Answer to it, I shall transcribe so much of it as relates to the Controversy concerning the Holy Spirit, *viz.* Herein I shall first consider how far we are agreed in this also: There is none of you do question whether this be he that moved upon the Waters in the Creation, or whether he be holy; or whether this be he that descended on our Lord Jesus Christ; or whether that he declares and makes known the very Mind and Will of God or no; or whether

ther his Operations may be properly called the Works of God or no; or whether it be he that our Lord Jesus Christ said should come or no; or whether his Assistance be helpful to mortify Sin, and perform Duties towards God with acceptance: nay, not only in this, but about all his Actions in the Saints, which I shall not stand in particular to name, both respecting the Manner, Matter, and Magnitude of them, I do think you both agree. So then still the difference lies here, whether he himself be the Essence of the most High from Eternity: a thing no where required to be known that I know of in the whole Book of God.

But admit it be so, that the Holy Spirit is in himself the most High God, then must it follow that he, as the most High, created the Heavens and the Earth, and so still preserveth the Creation: Then it follows that he that worships the most High God that created the Heavens and the Earth, and still preserveth the same according to that Knowledg attained of him in his Word; he, I say, then worships this Holy Spirit as much as he that particularly names him, altho in respect of his Office, he looks upon him differing from this most High God; and verily if we will heed the Scriptures, so we must all: for what he is in respect of his Essence, is not there expresly declared; but as he is manifested to us under the Notion of the Holy Spirit, he is declared to be different from the most High God, and therefore so to be believed in, *John* 16. 13. For there it is said of him, *That when he comes, he speaks not of himself, but what he hears*; sure not from himself, but from another that he speaks. From whence it is plain, that in respect of his Office, which is the thing signified by the denomination of [*Holy Spirit*] he is distinguished from the most High God, and a Messenger sent from him; and verily I think it highly necessary that every Christian should so conceive of him: for it is the Spirit that maketh unutterable Groans and Intercession for us unto the most High God, and not the most High that maketh Intercession to the most High. He then that believes in and of the Holy Spirit according to those Articles wherein you are agreed, I think his Faith in him is sufficient and according to the Scriptures.

AN

APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

A Short REPLY to a Book Intitul'd,

A Brief Inquiry whether they who aſſert, and they who deny the Divinity of our Lord Jeſus, may have Communion together at the Lord's Table, written by Mr. *Joſeph Taylor.*

HAVING finiſhed the precedent Sheets before I ſaw Mr. *Taylor*'s Book, I could not therein take notice of it. Mr. *Taylor* is one who for his Ingenuity I have long time highly eſteemed, tho we were never much perſonally acquainted. The reading his Book puts me in mind of what I mentioned in my Epiſtle to the Reader concerning thoſe little Buckets of Oil frequently ſtarting forth from the Preſs upon us to increaſe and inflame our Contentions: and I cannot forbear comparing this to one of thoſe fiery Bombs charged with ſuch Matter, that in whatſoever Church it falls and fires, that Church is in danger of being rent and torn in pieces. I think every body ought to ſet to their hand, according to their ability, to prevent the fatal Conſequences of ſo miſchievous a thing.

At firſt ſight I believed that a Reply thereto would be a very ſutable Appendix to my Book; but I ſhall be very brief, and not follow him into all particulars; partly becauſe I would not ſwell this Piece too much, and partly becauſe I have heard that it is expected that a more full and diſtinct Reply will come from another hand.

Firſt, I obſerve that Mr. *Taylor*'s main Arguments are originally *French*, and firſt appeared to the World in that Language: however, they are now adorned with an Engliſh Face and Tongue; and tho they were foreign by birth, yet they are now naturalized by the Act and Deed of an Engliſh Hand and Pen. Mr. *Taylor* confeſſes *page* 14. That he follows Monſieur *Abbadie* in his *French* Treatiſe of the *Divinity of our Lord*: and I can aſſure you, that the manner and matter of Mr. *Taylor*'s chief Arguments ſtand ſo fair and orderly, and in ſome places almoſt *verbatim* in Monſieur *Lamoth*'s Diſcourſe of the *Divinity*, with the Texts of Scripture (as they ſtand in Mr. *T*'s Book) in their order cited and improved, that at firſt ſight I began to think I had got another Impreſſion of Mr. *Taylor*'s Book in my hand. However, this Concluſion I quickly came to, that one muſt needs, in great meaſure at leaſt, be the Father of the other; and becauſe *Lamoth*'s bears date 1693, I concluded that his was ſenior. However it be, I wiſh Mr. *Taylor*, e're he undertook this Task, had well conſidered that we had already but too many Engliſh Incendiaries; and therefore that

that there was the leſs need to call in thoſe French Refugees to help pull down the Peace of our Churches about our Ears.

But to proceed, the deſign of Mr. *Taylor*'s Book, as he tells us, is to ſhew and evince that thoſe who aſſert, and they who deny that Chriſt is God, of the ſame Eſſence of his Father, ought not to have Communion together at the Table of the Lord. This he endeavours to demonſtrate from ten Reaſons ſo called.

But firſt, I muſt own my Ignorance of Mr. *Taylor*'s meaning by that Expreſſion, which he often uſes [Chriſt is God of the *Eſſence* of his Father] by which I think he muſt mean one of theſe four things.

Firſt, That Chriſt's Divinity is an Eſſence flowing from, or begotten of the moſt High, the ſame in *kind*, tho diſtinct in *number*.

Or ſecondly, That his Divinity is a *part* of the ſame Eſſence that is in the Father.

Or thirdly, That his Divinity is *all* and *whole* of the Divine *Eſſence* it ſelf.

Or fourthly, That he intends *none* of the Divine Eſſence, or eternal Being, neither in part nor whole, but only the *ſecond Perſon*.

If he means the firſt, that the Divinity of Chriſt is of the ſame kind with the Eſſence of the Father, but another diſtinct intelligent Being, and that this is alſo God moſt High; then this deſtroys the great Article of *one* Subſtance, wherein ſo joint an Agreement is: And God will then be no longer one, but unavoidably two intire, diſtinct, intelligent Beings; and ſo we ſhall have two Gods, two moſt Highs, two Almighties, two Alknowing ones: all which is nonſenſe beyond the fourth degree, as well as untruth. But ſure he doth not intend ſo.

Therefore, ſecondly, ſuppoſe he intends the ſame Eſſence of the Father for number, that is, a *part* of it; and ſo there is a part in the Father, and another part in the Son or Chriſt, which is Chriſt; but then this is to overthrow all our antient Creeds and Councils ſo much relied upon in this Caſe. *Athanaſius*'s Creed will be thwarted, which ſays, not *dividing* the Subſtance. Dr. *Owen*, Mr. *Wright*, Mr. *Preſton*, Mr. *Monk*, the 39 Articles, which ſay *without parts*, will all come in againſt him: and, as I ſhewed before, if we divide the Eſſence, we muſt in our thoughts divide the eſſential Properties. But I do not think Mr. *Taylor* will oppoſe himſelf to Reaſon, and ſo many famous Men and Creeds antient and modern, which will appear againſt him; and deny the abſolute Simplicity and Unity of God into the bargain.

But then, thirdly, if he means the Divinity of Chriſt is all and whole of the eternal ſupream Being it ſelf; then it follows, that the whole Eſſence of God moſt High was incarnate, was anointed, was ſent from Heaven to do another's Will, became our Mediator; yea that the *whole* Eſſence of God had a *Father*, for Chriſt had a Father, not only as he was the Son of Man, but as he was the Son of God. This contradicts Mr. *Monk*, and I think moſt other Writers, who ſay, the *Perſon*, not the *Eſſence*, was incarnate and anointed: and indeed the other ſeems a little ſtrange; for who ſhould anoint it? with what ſhould it be anointed? who ſhould ſend it? who ſhould it mediate unto? Beſides, if all the Divine Eſſence be anointed, there is abſolutely as much neceſſity of a Mediator betwixt us and Chriſt, as betwixt us and the Father, except it be ſaid that the Perſon of the Father only is offended. Now we know the Perſon of the Father is not the Eſſence it ſelf; for then Father muſt be anointed, and incarnate, and ſent, *&c.* But he (the Father) is ſaid to be only a certain manner of the Divine Eſſence its ſubſiſting: And then we muſt ſuppoſe that the Divine Eſſence it ſelf was not ſo much, or at all offended; but only one of the Modes or Manners of its ſubſiſting. But this will be thought deep myſteries to Country people. My ſhort ſight cannot ſee how to avoid this, except we will ſay, that as the whole Divine Eſſence ſubſiſts in the Father, there it is ſupream, the giver of all things, Higheſt, and can do all things, the anointed, the offended: But as the ſame whole Divine Eſſence ſubſiſts in the Son, or Chriſt, it is diſtinct from the Father, it is ſent, was anointed, incarnate, a Subject, a Mediator,

Mediator, a Reconciler, could do nothing of it ſelf. I know not whether Mr. *Taylor* will take this Courſe or no; but if he do, I am ſure he'll deſtroy the Notion that Chriſt is to be worſhipped as moſt High God: for if the divine Eſſence appear only ſupream in the Perſon of the Father, then in him (to wit, the Father) and under that name it is moſt proper to be worſhipped; which is moſt agreeable to Scripture. And as it is Chriſt, it is a diſtinct thing from God the Father; therefore as it is Chriſt, and ſo an Officer, we are to act Faith in what it doth, and not in what it is, ſince its eſſential Perfections appear ſupream only in the Perſon of the Father.

But fourthly, ſuppoſe Mr. *Taylor* intends none of all theſe; and tho he over and over talks of Chriſt's being of the ſame Eſſence of the Father, yet he intends nothing leſs; and that one Jot or Tittle, neither in whole nor part of the Divine Eſſence was incarnate, anointed, or was Chriſt, but only the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity diſtinct from Eſſence (to wit, the Son.) And this indeed is Mr. *Monk*'s Opinion in his *Cure for the cankering Error*, pag. 98. "We always diſtinguiſh "between the Eſſence of the Son, and the "Perſon, ſaying the Eſſence is one with the "Father, but *not his Perſon*; therefore we "ſay, his *Perſon* was begotten, not his "*Eſſence*: and we alſo ſay, his *Perſon* took "Fleſh of the Virgin *Mary*, not his Eſ-"ſence. This alſo ſeems to be the Opinion of many other Authors, although I have not now opportunity to ſearch and quote them. But if this indeed ſhould be his Opinion, how finely is he catch'd then? for they that have received his Book for Orthodox and good proof, are taught to believe that ſuch Perſons as deny, or do not believe that Chriſt is eſſentially God, are to be mark'd out for Excommunication and Damnation. Now if Mr. *Taylor* believes that the Divine Eſſence, neither whole nor part, jot or tittle, was incarnate, anointed, or was Chriſt, but only the Perſon, then he muſt needs be one of them appointed for Deſtruction and Excommunication, and ſo his fiery Bolt is returned into his own Boſom.

But ſuppoſe this indeed ſhould be his meaning, that only the ſecond Perſon (as I think moſt believe) was incarnate and anointed, then by Perſon he intends either an intelligent Being, Mind, or Spirit diſtinct from the one Eſſence, and the other two Perſons; or elſe he intends only a certain Manner or Mode of ſubſiſting of the one intelligent Being. If he intends the former, he muſt believe three or four diſtinct intelligent Beings, Minds, or Spirits, in God; and I think that will be three or four Gods.

But I could afford almoſt to paſs my word for Mr. *Taylor*, that he doth not intend ſo: Therefore I rather take him in the latter ſenſe, to wit, a Mode or Manner of ſubſiſting diſtinct from Eſſence. If ſo, then it will ſtill follow that Chriſt is not to be worſhipped as eſſentially God moſt High; for then he is not the Eſſence, but only a Manner or Mode of it. And I have before proved divine Worſhip, as to the moſt High, is to be given to the Divine Eſſence it ſelf, and not directly and formally to any particular Manner or Mode of it.

I might ſpeak more to this, but I fear I have ſaid ſo much already, that ſome ignorant People will be ready to think we Trinitarians, at leaſt ſome of us, hold ſtrange and nice Notions of Chriſt: Nay, perhaps they will ſay that we hold that Chriſt, as to his human Nature, or Manhood, is no Perſon, but a Nature only; and as to his Perſon is not Eſſence or Subſtance, but only a certain Manner or Mode of Eſſence: But enough of this. When all's done, I cannot tell which is Mr. *Taylor*'s meaning; and therefore I hereby pray him, if he appears in print again, to explain himſelf more diſtinctly and directly in this caſe.

I now come to conſider his Reaſons. His firſt Reaſon why ſuch as believe, and ſuch as disbelieve Chriſt to be of the Eſſence of his Father, ought not to have Communion together at the Table of the Lord, is, That either they that believe it, or thoſe that disbelieve it, muſt needs be Idolaters, and they muſt eſteem each other either guilty of Blaſphemy or Idolatry. To which I return theſe following Replies. Firſt,

First, I misslike the fashion of this Reason.

1. I do not approve the Expressions of Idolatry and Blasphemy, being too gross to be bestown so liberally on Persons so nearly united in the Faith of the true God, and the true Christ and his Laws, as I have in the foregoing sheets shewn they are. Milder Constructions and Expressions better become the Cause.

2. This manner of arguing seems to me too desperate. Mr. *Taylor* takes this Weapon pointed at both ends, and ventures to set one point at his own Breast, trusting in the strength of the Skin of his own Cause, and so makes a thrust at his Brethren.

Altho Mr. *Taylor* be a fallible Man, yet he is so confident that his Conceptions are certainly right in this confessed Mystery and Controversy, that hath puzled the most learned Men in all Ages (and sadly divides them at this time) that he ventures to proclaim it to the World, that in case he be mistaken, he is an Idolater, and leaves himself so upon Record to Posterity. I have heard of some who would hazard the loss of one of their Eyes, rather than their Neighbours should enjoy both theirs: Mr. *Taylor* will run the hazard of being accounted an Idolater, in case he be in the wrong, rather than his differing Brethren shall go without the Imputation of Idolaters and Blasphemers.

Secondly, I see no ground for that Clause in his Reason, *viz.* That they that disbelieve Christ to be essentially God, are Idolaters. I take Idolatry to be giving Divine Adoration and Worship to any Object, as if he were the most High God, when it is not the most High God.

Now these Unitarians that do not believe Christ to be essentially God most High, do not worship him as such, but as one receiving Power and Authority from another. But if Mr. *Taylor* be of the opinion that it is Idolatry, for any Reason, to give Worship and Honour to any Creature (as he seems to say pag. 23.) therein I dissent from him: for altho to worship any Creature as the most High when God allows it not (that is, when it doth not immediately represent him) be Idolatry, yet when Creatures shall and do immediately represent God most High, and receive Authority from him, I see not but we may without Idolatry worship them: for else first we shall in a manner impute Idolatry to *Abraham*, *Moses*, *David*, *John*, and others; for I remember *Abraham* bowed his Head, *Gen.* 18. when the three Angels came to him, and makes intercession to one of them for *Sodom*, giving him the Denomination of *my Lord:* I suppose no body thinks this Angel was essentially God; for then *Abraham* could not have seen him. Likewise *Moses* is commanded to pull off his Shoes in honour to the appearance of God by his Angel in the Bush. Likewise *David* fell on his Face to the ground before the Angel, and seems to direct his Prayer unto him, 1 *Chron.* 21. 16, 17. Likewise *Cornelius* gives the Denomination of *Lord* to the *Angel*, *Acts* 10. 4. Likewise *John* the Divine falls at the Angel's Feet, *Rev.* 1. 17. for tho the Revelation was Christ's, which God gave him, yet the discovery to *John* was made by the Angel, Chap. 1. 1.

But again, Mr. *Taylor* allows himself and others to worship a Creature without the imputation of Idolatry, namely the human Nature of Jesus Christ, *which, in his own Opinion, is a Creature only*; yet it was worshipped when it was on Earth, and Men begged Mercy of it: It is and ought to be worshipped now, and shall be worshipped hereafter.

But if Mr. *Taylor* reply, that this is for this particular reason, *viz.* because it is personally joined unto the Divine Nature, and therefore is not a Creature only.

I answer, 1*st*, That if we may, for any Reason, give worship to a Creature without being Idolaters; then at least his first Position is not universally true, *viz.* That to worship any Creature is Idolatry.

But 2*ly*, Suppose what Union you will in an orthodox Sense, yet the Divine Nature is no part of the human Nature, nor the human any part of the Divine Nature, but they are really distinct; therefore the human Nature, and every part thereof, is a Creature only.

And

And 3*ly*, Holy Scripture, if you'l believe and heed that, doth not any where ſay that we are to worſhip the Man Chriſt, becauſe it is perſonallly joined to the Divine Nature; but the Reaſon given why we ſhould worſhip it, is, becauſe it hath *received*, and God hath *given* and *committed* unto it Power, Authority, and Judgment: The principal Reaſon for ſo doing is, that all men ſhould honour the Son as they honour the Father. Likewiſe *Phil.* 2. 9, 10. Wherefore *God hath highly exalted him, and* given *him a Name, which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould bow, both of things in Heaven, and things in Earth.*

But thirdly; I further reply to Mr. *Taylor*'s firſt Reaſon, That altho, in caſe he be miſtaken, he hath wilfully thruſt himſelf into the number of Idolaters, and therefore deſerves but little pity; yet out of Charity I will help him a little, and endeavour to ſhew him that tho he ſhould be miſtaken, yet he is no Idolater, nor yet the others alſo.

My reaſon for it is this; He directs his Adoration and Worſhip to the whole Divine Eternal Being, that created all things, the true God, allowing alſo in him all the eſſential Attributes. Now he that worſhips the true God, cannot be an Idolater.

It is true, if Mr. *Taylor* be miſtaken, he is in an Error, becauſe he worſhips this Eſſence in the wrong place, to wit, in the Perſon of Chriſt, when it ſhould be in the Perſon of the Father only in Heaven: but ſtill it is the ſame Eſſence, he intends that and no other than he who is the God of *Abraham*.

And on the other hand; if the Unitarians be miſtaken, yet they intend to worſhip the ſame Eſſence all and whole, and no other; they believe it to be in the Perſon of Chriſt, but not to be anointed. They conceive it to be an intire Being ſubſiſting in the Father, yet ſtill the very Eſſence that we worſhip, and no other: Therefore neither can they be Idolaters. I will conclude my Anſwer to this firſt Reaſon with this Argument.

They that worſhip all and whole of the Divine Eſſence of the Eternal and Supream Being, who is the true God, are not therein, nor cannot be Idolaters or Blaſphemers. But both Trinitarians and Unitarians worſhip all and whole of the ſame Divine Eſſence of the Eternal and Supream Being, who *is the true God: Ergo*, neither Trinitarians nor Unitarians are Idolaters or Blaſphemers.

Thus I hope his firſt Reaſon is mortally wounded.

His ſecond Reaſon is, pag. 5. *Becauſe they that deny Chriſt is eſſentially God moſt High, deny the Perſon of the Son of God, and thereupon deny the true Chriſt, and bring another in his ſtead.*

He endeavours to prove this bold Aſſertion thus: If the Perſon of Chriſt conſiſt both of a divine and human Nature, which is the whole of his Perſon, then they who deny both Natures in Chriſt, deny the whole of his Perſon.

I anſwer, firſt, I utterly deny, and Mr. *Taylor* cannot prove, that any of our Brethren diſown both Natures in Chriſt.

But ſecondly, as hath been ſhewn, Mr. *Taylor* ought to have ſhewed what he intended by Divine Nature, whether the Eſſence of God in kind, in part, or in whole; or whether none of it, but a Perſon only.

Thirdly, I have heard ſome ſay that the human Nature was no part of the Perſon of Chriſt: And they ſeem to argue not without Reaſon; for, ſay they, if the ſecond Perſon in the Trinity be God, then it was a perfect and compleat Perſon before its aſſuming Fleſh: for whatever is, or is in God, is perfect and compleat to a tittle; now that which is perfect and compleat, can have nothing added to it without making it imperfect, as a Yard or Ell that is exact and perfect in meaſure can have nothing in the leaſt meaſure added to its length, but you make it thereby imperfect. Therefore though it be believed that human Nature was joined to this Perſon, yet it was no part of the Perſon; and Mr. *Taylor*'s ſuppoſition that Chriſt's Perſon conſiſteth of a divine and human Nature, cannot be true.

But, Fourthly, Mr. *Taylor* doth but ſuppoſe that Chriſt's Perſon conſiſteth of divine Nature or Eſſence, he doth not here offer to prove it: Now tho it ſhould be true, and grant-

granted that others have proved it; and tho it be supposed that he can prove it, yet till he has proved it, it is but begging the Question; And therefore I need here say no more to it.

But, Fifthly, Mr. *Taylor* improves this Reason, *p.* 6. thus: *If they that deny what is essential to his Godhead may be said to deny God, then they may be said to deny Christ, who deny what is essential to his Person.*

Whatever may be said to this, I will not now quarrel with it; I think I can give it him, and yet not hurt my Cause. But my eye is upon another Assertion, *p.* 7. derived from this; *The divine Nature is essential to the Person of Christ.*

To this I answer, *First*, (as to the former) Till this Assertion be proved, the Question is but begg'd.

Secondly, I do not see the Consequences of this Argument. I confess they who deny that Christ received Power from God, deny his Authority; they that deny him to be anointed of God, deny him to be the Christ of God; they who deny him to be Christ who was born of *Mary*, deny the true Person of Christ: but how they who deny him to be the Essence of God, deny his Person, I verily do not see; unless Mr. *Taylor* had first said and proved, that Christ could not be a Person except he were essentially God, or which is all one, that to be of the Essence of God, is an essential Property of a Person. But I do not think that this can be thought or proved to be the necessary Part of a Person; for then no *Man* can be a *Person* except he be of the divine Essence. I conceive, if any Man should deny that Christ had a Mind, a Soul, a Life, &c. he would indeed deny the Person of Christ, because he denys him to have or to be *that* without which it is impossible to be a Person. But to deny Christ to be a Person, except he be essentially God, is strange Logick to me, and I doubt not to most considering Men. Now the Unitarians, at least those whom I mainly vindicate, do believe that Christ had all that needed to make him a compleat Person, as Life, Soul, Mind, &c. They also believe that this Person was anointed of God, which is sufficient to make him a compleat Christ; and they are right in all, and deny none of his Offices. I'll conclude my Answer to this Reason with this Argument: They that believe that Jesus of *Nazareth* had all that was sufficient to render him a compleat Person, and a compleat Christ, cannot truly be said to deny the true Person of the true Christ. But the Unitarians believe that Jesus of *Nazareth* had all that was sufficient to make him a compleat Person and a compleat Christ. Therefore the Unitarians cannot truly be said to deny the true Person of the true Christ. Thus this Reason lies a bleeding.

But his third Reason is, *p.* 10. *Because that a Man cannot be said to be a true Believer in Jesus Christ, that denys Christ to be of the Essence of his Father.* And his ground for this Reason is this, *Because there can be no Act of Faith without the true Object of Faith.* This latter Assertion I can grant him.

Now the true Object of Faith in this case is Jesus of *Nazareth*; but, quite contrary to Mr. *Taylor*, I argue: If the Unitarians have the true Object of Faith, then they are in that Particular true Believers in Christ; but they have the true Object of Faith, *Ergo* they are true Believers in Christ.

I prove the *minor* thus: If Jesus of *Nazareth* be the true Object, and they believe in him, then they have the true Object of Faith: But Jesus of *Nazareth* is the true Object of Faith, and they believe in him; therefore they (the Unitarians) have the true Object of Faith.

But if Mr. *Taylor* intends by having the Object of Faith, that none can have a true Object of Faith, except they understand and know the true Nature and Matter thereof, and whereof it consisteth; then I confess I am wholly of another Mind from him: for at that rate we can have no Object of Faith, because we are utterly ignorant of the original Nature of any Thing or Substance. Must not *Israel* believe that the *Manna* was sufficient Food, because they knew not the Original, or the Nature of it? Must not I believe that there is a Sun, because I am ignorant from what that glorious Orb was produced? Neither do we know its Nature; nay, we know not the Nature of any Being, tho such

as we daily converſe with. 'Tis much controverted by ſome of the greateſt Searchers into Nature's Secrets, whether the Fire be Light or Heat, or whether it be either or neither of them both. Muſt not I believe I have a Soul, tho ignorant of its Subſtance? Neither do I certainly know its Original, whether produced by natural Generation or Infuſion. Muſt not I believe there is a Wind, tho I know not its Subſtance or Matter? To conclude, In the ſame hour I was writing this, I caſt my eye on Dr. *Sherlock*'s Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity; and in *page* 7. I found theſe words; "It is ſo far "from being a wonder to meet with any "thing we do not perfectly underſtand, that "I know nothing in the world which we do "perfectly underſtand: it is agreed by all "Men, who ever conſidered this Matter, "that the *Eſſence* of things cannot be known, "but only their Properties and Qualities. Thus far Dr. *Sherlock*.

Mr. *Taylor*'s fourth Reaſon is in *page* 11. *Becauſe they that deny Chriſt to be the Eſſence of God, deny the Lord that bought them.*

This Reaſon ſtanding on the ſame bottom with the former, the ſame Anſwer may ſuffice.

His ſixth Reaſon (for he hath no fifth that I can find) is: *This Principle of Chriſt's being the Eſſence of God, is the Rock upon which Chriſt hath built his Church.* For proof of which he cites *Mat.* 16. 15, where *Peter* confeſſeth, *Thou art Chriſt the Son of the living God:* And our Lord ſaith, *Upon this Rock will I build my Church.* But the neceſſary Conſequence of Mr. *Taylor*'s Reaſon or Proof is ſo far off, that my dull Genius will not reach it: I will put it into the form of an Argument.

To be a Son of God, is to be the Eſſence of God: But Chriſt owns that he is the Son of God; *Ergo*, He owns he is the Eſſence of God.

But then perhaps ſome unhappy Brain or other will ſay, At that rate of Reaſoning one may prove *Adam*, Angels and Saints to be all the very Eſſence of God; for they are all called Sons of God. I ſpeak not this as ſuppoſing that Chriſt is the Son of God in no other Senſe than *Adam*, Angels and Saints are; but to ſhew how more Mr. *Taylor*'s Arguing comes of what he intends it for.

But Mr. *Taylor* ſaith, *page* 13. *Except by the word* Son of God, *we underſtand one and the ſame thing, it is impoſſible we ſhould have one and the ſame Faith.*

If this be true, ſetting the Unitarians aſide, there are not many of us Trinitarians have one and the ſame Faith: for ſome by *Son of God* intend a diſtinct intelligent Being and Mind from Father and Spirit, as Dr. *Sherlock*. Some ſay, it is only a Mode of the divine Eſſence, but not the divine Eſſence it ſelf, as Mr. *Monk*. Some in effect ſay, it is called a Perſon, but indeed in a proper Senſe is not; and that therefore it is a Somewhat, as Dr. *Wallis*. Some ſay, it is a Quality and Property of the divine Eſſence. Some ſay, it is the Eſſence it ſelf. The School-men ſay, it is God knowing himſelf by a reflex Act. Thus you ſee we are all to pieces amongſt our ſelves; and when we are united, and underſtand by *the Son of God* one and the ſame thing, 'tis like the Unitarians will fall in with us.

But alas, alas! now am I come to the killing Reaſon of all Reaſons, to wit the ſeventh, *page* 13. if I can but diſpatch it, I ſhall think my Work near done; it is this:

The Doctrine of Chriſt his being the Eſſence of God, is a Principle of that Conſequence, that the Chriſtian Religion ſtands or falls with it.

To demonſtrate this, Mr. *Taylor* lays down theſe two fearful and monſtrous Poſitions, namely: *That if Jeſus Chriſt be not true God, of the ſame Eſſence with his Father; it follows, firſt, that the Mahometan Religion is preferable to the Chriſtian, and* Mahomet *was a greater Prophet than* Chriſt.

Secondly, That Chriſt was an Impoſtor and Deceiver; the Jews did juſtly in ſentencing him to Death for Blaſphemy: That the Chriſtian Religion is Idolatry and Superſtition, and the Meſſias is not yet come.

This roaring Reaſon makes a terrible Noiſe in Country Churches. If this be true, 'twere enough to make a Man afraid to come near a Uni-

Unitarian as long as one lives. Unitarians did I say? nay, Mercy, Mercy; for as on several of our leading Trinitarians, what will become of them? for Mr. *Monk* plainly denies that Christ is the Essence of God, but only a Person or Mode. Dr. *Wallis* is of the same Mind; and I am almost afraid Mr. *Taylor* is leaning that way; and if he should, what a lamentable thing would that be!

But now by way of Reply: First, observe that this Expression, *Christ of the Essence of his Father*, is not directly in express terms taught us by our Lord, or the holy Scripture. Secondly, That our Proofs are only Consequences, a long time ago, and still much controverted by very learned Men; and yet Mr. *Taylor* adventures to be so confident as to say in effect, that supposing his Opinion be not true, that is, if he be mistaken, then Christ must needs be beneath *Mahomet*, nay an Impostor, and the Jews did well to put him to Death for Blasphemy.

These are very high Words, and look too bold and presumptuous. I confess if the Pope and Church of *Rome* had said so, it had been no very surprising thing; because they believing themselves infallible, might therefore look upon their Interpretation of Scripture, even in the most nice and dubious Points, to be certainly and infallibly true; for infallible Persons cannot err.

But for Mr. *Taylor*, who (I doubt not) thinks himself a fallible Man; for him, I say, to hug and magnify his own Opinion in so intricate and curious a Question, wherein (as hath been hinted) the most learned Trinitarians are greatly divided in their Apprehensions, and to value it at such a rate as to think and proclaim that either his Notion must be true, or Christ must be false, this is very amazing. And I cannot forbear thinking that Mr. *Taylor* had Monsieur *Lamy*'s Book by him, when he penn'd this Reason. *Lamy* in his Discourse of the Trinity, p. 15. hath these Expressions; "That in case the Do-"ctrine of the Trinity, as now held, be not "true, then the Apostle *Paul* had not com-"mon Sense, nor any tolerable degree of "Understanding, nay was a Mad-man; and "the rest of the Apostles were Blasphemers. "And page 33. I make no difficulty (saith "he), to say, they have deceived us most "shamefully, and their Writings are no bet-"ter than continual Blasphemy if Christ be "not God.

But, Secondly, I shall endeavour to demonstrate, that in case Mr. *Taylor* should be mistaken, and Christ be supposed not to be of the Essence of God, yet it doth not thence follow (notwithstanding all Mr. *Taylor* says) that he was worse than *Mahomet*, or that the Christian Religion is worse than *Mahometism*. To which purpose I will consider what he says.

His chief, if not only Reason for this, is in page 15. *Because the Christian Religion brings in Idolatry, but* Mahomet *abolishes it.*

I answer, I shall not concern my self with *Mahometism*, nor magnify it for expelling Idolatry: But for the Christian Religion, that it brings in Idolatry in the case supposed, I deny; for if the Christian Religion necessarily brings in Idolatry, it must be either in the Unitarians or the Trinitarians: But it doth not necessarily bring in Idolatry in the Unitarians, nor yet in the Trinitarians; therefore the Christian Religion doth not necessarily bring in Idolatry.

To make short; for proof of the *minor*, I refer you to the close of my Answer to his first Reason.

I come now to his second monstrous Assertion, namely, *If Christ be not the Essence of God, then he is an Impostor.*

Now the consequence of this I deny, and on the contrary affirm, that tho Christ were not of the Essence of the most High, yet he is no Impostor; which I prove by this Argument.

If Christ did never affirm himself to be the Essence of God, nor compel any Body so to believe; then tho he should not be so, yet in this he is no Impostor. But Christ did never affirm himself to be the Essence of God, nor compel or command any Body so to believe: *Ergo*, Altho he should not be so, yet in this case he was no Impostor.

The *minor* I thus prove:

If Christ did ever affirm himself to be the Essence of God most High, or command any

Body so to believe; then Mr. *Taylor*, or some body else, can shew us where or when he did so. But Mr. *Taylor* nor no body else can shew us where or when he did so: *Ergo*, Christ did never affirm himself to be the Essence of God.

In Argumentation that which appears not is not: when an Instance is given that Christ did so, then my Argument must fall to the ground.

And it is remarkable that when the Jews charged him, that he being a Man made himself God, *John* 10. 33. after he had told them that Men in their Law had been called Gods, saith he, *ver.* 36. *Say ye of him that the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the World, Thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God?* From whence I observe, that whatever the Essence of Christ is, yet he as Christ did not oblige any Body to believe that he was of the Essence of God; for he doth not here plead or answer: Say ye of him who is the *Essence of God?* but him whom the *Father* hath *sent*. So that the Essence of God is not only not expressed, but utterly hidden and excluded in this Answer, for that Essence can be sent by none.

In the next place; As Christ hath not any where that I know of required us to believe him to be the Essence of God, so neither doth Mr. *Taylor* prove him to be so.

To prevent Mistakes, take notice, as I never did, so I do not now deny that Christ is essentially God: it is a great and deep Controversy. But I say, whatever others have done, or Mr. *Taylor* can do, he in this Book, I humbly conceive, hath not done it; and till he has done, he begs the Question. I will scan his Proofs, tho it had been better for another, than I who am a Trinitarian, to have done it. Another Inconvenience also attends me, *viz.* I have not room enough, but am constrained only to touch at things: However, in short I will hint at the most remarkable things I observe, and not stand to speak to all Particulars.

His first Essay is *page* 24. *Because the Names of God are applied to Christ.* First, I answer, That those who read impartially those Texts he cites, may find that several of them speak particularly of God the Father. Secondly, It doth not necessarily follow, because the Name of God is sometimes given to Christ, that therefore he is essentially God most High; for the Name of God hath been given to Men, to *Moses*, to *Solomon*, and divers chief Magistrates.

Secondly, he says *page* 25. *That the incommunicable Names of God are given him, namely*, Jehovah, *and* I Am. I answer, both these Names have also been applied to Angels, *Zech.* 3. 1, 2. *Exod.* 3. 4, 14.

Next, Mr. *Taylor* comes to distinguishing Characters, *p.* 26, 27. First *Omniscience*: his Disciples say, *Thou knowest all things*. I answer, I remember the Woman of *Tekoah* told *David*, that he was as an Angel of God, to know all things that were done in the Earth; and yet *David* was not God. Also the Angel that appeared to *Abraham* could tell *Sarah* that she laugh'd, tho she laugh'd but in her mind. Likewise the Prophet could tell *Jeroboam*'s Wife who she was, and why she came, ere he saw her. And on the other side, Christ expresly saith, that the Father shews him all things; and that Revelation which *John* had of Christ, Christ had and received first of his Father, *Rev.* 1. 1. And yet he says that he knew not the day of Judgment.

Next Mr. *Taylor* urges his *Omnipresence*; Christ would be with his Disciples to the end of the World. But doth not *Paul* tell the *Colossians*, Col. 2. 5. *That tho he was absent in the Flesh, yet he was present in the Spirit, joying and beholding their Order?* yet *Paul* was not God.

Next Mr. *Taylor* urges his *Omnipotency*; he had all Power. But doth not Christ say, that all Power was given him? which could not be as he was God; for God most High can have no Power given him. And, Secondly, the Son saith expresly, *John* 5. 30. *I can of my self do nothing.*

Next Mr. *Taylor* urges his *Immortality*. But it is said of a Man (*viz. Melchisedec*) that he was without beginning of Days or end of Life, and abideth for ever. Moreover, the Text Mr. *Taylor* cites may mean God the Father. A larger Answer may be given hereafter, if God permit; at present let this suffice

ſuffice to theſe Inſtances.

And whereas Mr. *Taylor* urges, pag. 29. *The Works that Chriſt did* [illegible] confeſs this had been a good Argument, had not Chriſt done it in his Father's Name and Power, and affirmed, that of himſelf he could do nothing; and when he raiſes *Lazarus*, he prays to his Father to ſhew whence the power came.

Next Mr. *Taylor* urges that Chriſt was *one* with the Father. But doth not Chriſt pray, John 17. 22. *That his Diſciples may be one, as he and his Father are one?* which Oneneſs of Chriſt's Diſciples cannot be ſuppoſed to be meant of Eſſence; for Chriſt's true Diſciples are no more one in Eſſence after Converſion than they were before.

As to what Mr. *Taylor* ſaith from pag. 33, to 38. concerning worſhipping Chriſt; for anſwer, the Reader may obſerve what I have ſaid concerning worſhipping Chriſt in the firſt part of this Book, where I think I have ſhewn that the whole Divine Eſſence is to be worſhipped as ſubſiſting in the Perſon of the Father, and that Divine Worſhip (I mean the higheſt Adoration) is not to be given to the Perſons of the Trinity diſtinct from one another; for that cannot be done without making three or four diſtinct Objects of our higheſt Adoration, which ought not to be. I have alſo ſhewn that the Worſhip due to Chriſt is as he is Mediator, and the immediate Repreſentative of God to us; and that we are to worſhip him as one that hath received Power from another, *John* 5. 23. And this Worſhip is to be given to him as he is a Man; for it was the Manhood that was exalted; *That at the Name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould bow.* And it is very remarkable that the Worſhip we are to pay to Chriſt is in honour of another, to wit the Father, *Phil.* 2. 10, 11. *every Knee is to bow to him, and every Tongue confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.* Every Tongue ſpeaking to the Judg confeſſeth that he is Lord, to the honour of the King his Maſter. From the forecited place I argue:

He that receives Worſhip and Honour, in honour, and to the glory of another, is not himſelf worſhipped as the ſupream Being and higheſt Power. But Jeſus Chriſt receives Worſhip and Honour, in honour, and to the glory of another; therefore he himſelf is not worſhipped as the ſupream Being and higheſt Power.

Laſtly, Mr. *Taylor* urges, pag. 39. *That thoſe Scriptures of the Old Teſtament that are applicable to none but the moſt High God, are aſcribed to him, viz.* to Chriſt. That is (as I take his meaning) ſome Scriptures that ſpeak of God in the Old Teſtament are applied unto Chriſt in the New; and ſo he gives divers Inſtances. I did deſign to have given a particular Reply to each of his Inſtances, but becauſe I have exceeded my Bounds already, I ſhall content my ſelf at preſent with ſome Reflies in general.

Firſt, I obſerve he cites ſome Texts in the New Teſtament, and applies them to Chriſt, which ſpeak only of God the Father.

Secondly, The Scripture is not altogether without Inſtances, that ſometimes that which in a ſtrict and moſt proper ſenſe belongs only to God moſt High, yet hath in ſome ſenſe been applied to Creatures, and to that which it was not his Eſſence. It is proper only to the Eſſence of God to cauſe man to die with the ſight of it: *No man*, ſays God, *can ſee my Face and live:* Yet when *Jacob* wreſtled with the Angel, *Gen.* 32. 30. he ſeems to attribute this Property to the Angel, looking on it a great wonder that his Life was preſerved; ſays he, *I have ſeen God face to face, and my Life is preſerved.* He whom *Jacob* here calls God, is called an Angel. In *Hoſea* 12. 4. he is called *the Lord God of Hoſts, the Lord is his Memorial.* And the Angel that appears in the Buſh to *Moſes*, takes to himſelf the incommunicable Names and Work of the moſt High.

And if the applying ſome Scriptures in the Old Teſtament, ſpeaking of God, to Chriſt in the New Teſtament, be an Argument to prove him to be God; at that rate of reaſoning I can prove Chriſt to be *David*, and to be all *Iſrael*, and *John the Baptiſt* to be *Elias*; becauſe *David*, ſpeaking of himſelf in the 22d Pſalm, ſays, ver. 18. *They parted my Garments amongſt them, and caſt Lots upon my Veſture:* And likewiſe of himſelf, Pſal.

69. says, *They gave me also Gall for my Meat, and in my thirst they gave me Vinegar to drink.* Now these Texts in the New Testament, *Mat.* 27. 34, 35. are expressly applied to Christ: Is Christ therefore *David?* Likewise it is said, *Hosea* 11. 1. *When* Israel *was a Child, then I lov'd him, and called my Son out of* Egypt; and this is applied to Christ, *Mat.* 2. 15. Is Christ therefore all *Israel?* And because the Lord says, Mal. 4. 5. *Behold, I will send you* Elijah *the Prophet*; which is expressly applied to *John* the Baptist, *Mat.* 11. 14. and *Luke* 1. 17. will it therefore infallibly prove *John* to be *Elias?* Many would look upon this to be strange and absurd arguing.

As to Mr. *Taylor*'s last three Reasons, because I haste to have done; and because I think when what I have wrote is considered, they will do neither good nor hurt to our Cause; I will therefore wholly omit them.

In what I have said as a Reply to Mr. *Taylor*'s Endeavours to prove that Christ is of the Essence of God, I would not be understood as denying the thing, neither did I ever deny it: but my Design is to shew him and others, that if he intends to prove this point, he must raise his Arguments to a higher pitch, or add new ones, because these are too obscure and weak to do it.

Tho in the main I profess my self orthodox, yet if in any place I have dropt any such Expressions as may be judged novel, I hope the candid Reader will consider that the Controversy is deep, and variously understood and explained by the most learned of our Party, as hath been hinted, namely, Dr. *Sherlock*, Dr. *Wallis*, Dr. *S--th*, Mr. *Monck*, and others; who do all of them, in some considerable point or other, differ from each other about these things; 'Tis therefore no wonder if in some point or other I should not agree with all of them.

And if at unawares I shall or have advanced any Expression contrary to sound Doctrine, upon information and conviction I shall be ready to sign a Recantation. And if after this Apology, any body shall in any kind maliciously persecute me, I think I shall suffer with more honour than my Prosecutor can prosecute me.

The Author hereof having much to do, and labouring under several Infirmities, and troubles of Mind, desires the Prayers of such as may receive any advantage by his Labours.

FINIS.